

The roll call was concluded.

Mr. CAFFERY. I have a general pair with the Senator from Michigan [Mr. BURROWS], and therefore withhold my vote.

Mr. NELSON. As I have stated, I have a general pair with the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. VEST]. I transfer that pair to the Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. ALDRICH], and vote "nay."

Mr. HANSBROUGH. I take the liberty of transferring my pair with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. DANIEL] to the Senator from Colorado [Mr. WOLCOTT], and vote "nay."

Mr. SULLIVAN. I suggest the absence of a quorum, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair will state to the Senator that the result of the vote has not yet been announced.

Mr. HAWLEY. I take advantage of that observation to ask permission to make an announcement. I had hoped to have an executive session this evening, but I am now satisfied that it will be impossible.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Debate is not in order, but the Senator from Connecticut, by the indulgence of the Senate, may make a statement.

Mr. HAWLEY. Of course, the statement is being made, as I suppose, by unanimous consent. I want to give notice that I shall to-morrow morning, immediately after the morning business, move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The result was announced—yeas 9, nays 28; as follows:

YEAS—9.

Bate,
Butler,
Jones, Ark.

Kenney,
McLaurin,

Mallory,
Sullivan,

Turley,
Turner.

NAYS—28.

Allison,
Bacon,
Bard,
Beveridge,
Chandler,
Clapp,
Cullom,

Deboe,
Fairbanks,
Foraker,
Gallinger,
Hansbrough,
Hawley,
Kearns,

Kyle,
Lodge,
Mason,
Nelson,
Perkins,
Pettigrew,
Platt, Conn.

Proctor,
Sewell,
Shoup,
Spooner,
Stewart,
Warren,
Wetmore.

NOT VOTING—51.

Aldrich,
Allen,
Baker,
Berry,
Burrows,
Caffery,
Carter,
Chilton,
Clark,
Clay,
Cockrell,
Culberson,
Daniel,

Depew,
Dillingham,
Dolliver,
Elkins,
Foster,
Frye,
Hale,
Hanna,
Harris,
Heitfeld,
Hoar,
Jones, Nev.
Kean,

Lindsay,
McBride,
McComas,
McCumber,
McEnery,
McMillan,
Martin,
Money,
Morgan,
Penrose,
Pettus,
Platt, N. Y.
Pritchard,

Quarles,
Quay,
Rawlins,
Scott,
Simon,
Tallafiero,
Teller,
Thurston,
Tillman,
Vest,
Wellington,
Wolcott.

So the Senate refused to adjourn.

Mr. CHANDLER. I ask that the roll of the Senate may be called.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will call the roll.

Mr. PETTIGREW. Have we not a right to insist on having the names of the absentees first called?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. A quorum not having been recorded on the vote just taken, under the rules of the Senate only a call of the Senate or a motion to adjourn is in order.

The Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BACON (when Mr. CLAY's name was called). I desire to say that my colleague [Mr. CLAY] has been at work all day in committee and has left the Chamber because of very serious indisposition.

Mr. LODGE (when Mr. HOAR's name was called). I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. HOAR] is necessarily absent from the city.

Mr. SPOONER (when Mr. QUARLES's name was called). My colleague [Mr. QUARLES] is necessarily absent from the city.

The roll call having been concluded, it appeared that the following Senators had answered to their names:

Allison,
Bacon,
Bard,
Bate,
Beveridge,
Burrows,
Butler,
Caffery,
Chandler,
Chilton,
Clapp,

Cullom,
Deboe,
Dolliver,
Fairbanks,
Foraker,
Frye,
Gallinger,
Hansbrough,
Hawley,
Jones, Ark.
Kearns,

Kenney,
Kyle,
Lodge,
Mallory,
Mason,
Nelson,
Perkins,
Pettigrew,
Pettus,
Platt, Conn.
Proctor,

Rawlins,
Sewell,
Shoup,
Spooner,
Stewart,
Sullivan,
Tillman,
Warren,
Wetmore.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Forty-two Senators have responded to the roll call, lacking 3 of a quorum.

Mr. PROCTOR. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Wednesday, February 13, 1901, at 11 o'clock a. m.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

TUESDAY, February 12, 1901.

The House met at 12 o'clock m.

The Chaplain, Rev. HENRY N. COUDEN, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father who art in heaven, we are reminded of a strong, rugged, pure, noble life which, under the dispensation of Thy providence, found its way into this world ninety-two years ago to-day, and, though born of obscure parents, reared in penury, yet by his own industry and the nobility of his soul rose gradually to the highest position in the gift of his countrymen and left in his works behind him a monument which shall endure through all the ages. We thank Thee for that life, and we pray Thee that we may copy all his virtues in the spirit of the Lord Jesus Christ. Amen.

The Journal of yesterday's proceedings was read, corrected, and approved.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. ALLEN of Maine, for four days, on account of important business.

To Mr. BALL, indefinitely, on account of sickness.

To Mr. BURTON, for two days, on account of important business.

To Mr. GROSVENOR, for two days, on account of illness.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. CUNNINGHAM, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 13374. An act authorizing the Indiana, Illinois and Iowa Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across St. Joseph River at or near the city of St. Joseph, Mich.

The message also announced that the Senate had insisted upon its amendment to the bill (H. R. 12394) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide ways and means to meet war expenditures, and for other purposes," approved June 13, 1898, and to reduce taxation thereunder, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. ALDRICH, Mr. ALLISON, and Mr. JONES of Arkansas as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

THE RECORD.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up what I claim to be an infringement of the privileges of the House by the insertion of a letter signed "Republican," which appears on page 2327 of the RECORD of this morning. I will not take the time of the House to read the letter. It was read in the presence of the Committee of the Whole House yesterday afternoon, and is now before every member of the House in the RECORD published this morning.

This matter I claim is before the House properly in two ways. It was, by vote of the Committee of the Whole House, reported to the House as an occurrence for its consideration, and is here as unfinished business.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I do not understand the gentleman has made any motion. I reserve all points of order against any motion he may make. I do not want to waive that. The gentleman can take his own course in making the motion.

Mr. KNOX. I am about to state the motion. I will offer a resolution in a moment. I claim this is before the House as unfinished business of yesterday on a report of the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, and the motion made that the letter be stricken from the RECORD. It is before the House again this morning properly in the published RECORD which we have before us, of which the House has entire and full jurisdiction. The RECORD is the property of the House. It contains the proceedings of the House, and the House has entire jurisdiction to deal with anything contained in the RECORD.

Now, Mr. Speaker, while I agree that a member of the House upon his own responsibility may charge any sort of an offense against one who is not a member and not be liable to be called to an account here for it, yet when he introduces a paper read from the Clerk's desk to be inserted in the RECORD, then the House assumes and has jurisdiction of the paper to say whether it contains improper matter or not. And if it does, if it is scandalous, if perchance it be indecent or obscene, then the House in its full jurisdiction may strike it from the RECORD.

No argument, I submit, is necessary to convince the House that this letter goes to the very verge of scandal and abuse. It is an anonymous letter inserted in the RECORD, charging most disgraceful offenses. It has no responsibility behind it. And unless the House is willing to say that the RECORD hereafter shall be made the avenue for circulating anonymous charges against this man and that man, then no stronger case can be made out where a letter

should be stricken from the RECORD and no longer disgrace the proceedings of this House.

It is before us in the fact that the RECORD is before us, and we have jurisdiction to deal with it here and now. It is not a question of to-day or to-morrow; it is a question for the long future, whether we are to make this RECORD such an avenue of abuse of citizens of the country.

Now, Mr. Speaker, no particular process is necessary to bring this matter to the attention of the House. This is entirely analogous to proceedings in court. A member of the bar, under the oath of office which he takes when he is admitted as an attorney, has the right to file papers in court. He may file declarations, he may file answers, he may file all sorts of pleadings; but he has no right to file a paper which is scandalous. If he does, then no motion is necessary to take it from the records of the court. The court may of its own motion find upon inspection that the paper is scandalous and may strike it from the record. I believe, Mr. Speaker, that it was entirely in the power of the Speaker himself, upon the inspection of this RECORD, and with no motion or suggestion, to strike this letter from the RECORD. I do not ask that. I ask the House, which has entire jurisdiction of the matter, to strike this from the RECORD; and I ask for the adoption of the resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. What is the paper sent up by the gentleman?

Mr. KNOX. A resolution which I ask to have read, and of which I shall move the adoption.

The SPEAKER. The resolution will be read for the information of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the letter printed upon page 2527 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD and signed "Republican," which letter was read while the House was in the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union on Monday, February 11, 1901, is scandalous, an infringement of the privileges of the House, and a violation of the propriety of debate; and that said letter be stricken from the RECORD.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the adoption of that resolution, and on that question I ask the previous question.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I desire to make a point of order on the resolution.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Surely the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KNOX], after having made his speech, is not going to move the previous question?

Mr. KNOX. Well, I will withdraw the previous question if the gentleman desires to be heard.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. Let me say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that I believe the first part of this resolution ought not to be adopted. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to vote to strike that anonymous letter from the record of this House [applause], because the records of this House are no place for anonymous communications. But the gentleman's resolution asks us to say that the letter is slanderous, which I am unwilling to do. If the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. KNOX] will eliminate from his resolution all except the proposition to strike out the anonymous letter, I will cheerfully vote for it.

Mr. KNOX. I am entirely willing to modify the resolution so that it will simply provide for striking out the letter.

Mr. BAILEY of Texas. That is right.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to call the attention of the gentleman from Massachusetts to this point. The Committee of the Whole House reported to the House a resolution containing a motion that the letter be stricken from the RECORD. That is the matter, in the opinion of the Chair, which is before this House; and the Chair has very grave doubts about the propriety of offering this resolution or submitting it to the House, considering the fact that the Committee of the Whole has laid before the House, through the report of its Chairman, the resolution which was adopted in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. KNOX. I am entirely willing to rely upon the resolution reported from the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks that that puts the matter before the House.

Mr. KNOX. I ask, then, to withdraw my resolution.

The SPEAKER. The question is upon the motion to strike the letter from the RECORD. That was the question before the House. The Chair is of opinion that the rule requiring a resolution to precede consideration where the dignity of the House is involved is satisfied when the Committee of the Whole lays a resolution before the House. If this were an individual matter, of course the gentleman could be heard, and debate would proceed unless cut off by the previous question, or until the House was ready to pass upon it. That question, in the judgment of the Chair, is not presented now.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. SULZER. I desire, Mr. Speaker, to be heard briefly on the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts to strike the letter in question from the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts withdraw the demand for the previous question?

Mr. KNOX. How much time does the gentleman from New York desire?

Mr. SULZER. I desire to be heard very briefly, not more than four or five minutes.

Mr. KNOX. I will yield to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker, if I can do so, five minutes.

Mr. SULZER. I shall probably not need that much time.

Mr. Speaker, I am somewhat at a loss to understand the anxiety of the gentleman from Massachusetts and his associates to protect this man Perry S. Heath. He is not a member of this House. The position the gentleman assumes seems somewhat anomalous and curious. It is amusing to me. While some of his party colleagues on that side of the House took a manifest delight yesterday in attacking my personal character, they at the same time seem anxious now to protect and shield this man Heath from the responsibility that should rest on him. Heath attacked me in the last campaign. I simply struck back. He lied about me. I told the truth about him. I stand here, Mr. Speaker, to say that there is no man in this House who can charge me with any offense whatever or with any misconduct.

My life is, and always has been, an open book; and when the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MAHON] yesterday made certain insinuations against me I was justified in my resentment, and was justified in "smoking out" the real culprit, Mr. Heath, who had made the charge against me in the last campaign. I did smoke him out. He is Perry S. Heath, the secretary of the national Republican committee. I had the courage to stand here yesterday, Mr. Speaker, and say that I was responsible, as I now repeat, for everything contained in that letter. It is all true, and I dare Mr. Heath to successfully controvert its statements. I understand my responsibility in making such a statement. I repeat now that I am entirely responsible for all that I have said. I waived my constitutional prerogative yesterday, and I waive it now. [Applause.] And if Mr. Heath thinks that there is anything scandalous, anything libelous, in that letter, let him sue me, and I stand ready to meet the suit and prove all the charges. I challenge him to truthfully disprove the facts stated in that letter. Let him answer the questions therein contained. He dare not do it.

Why, Mr. Speaker, this morning a distinguished gentleman in this city, formerly a Representative on the floor of this House, said to me that I was justified and safe in standing by the statements in that letter, "because every word in it was the truth."

Mr. Speaker, I have no objection now to this letter being stricken from the RECORD, because I feel confident that the Republicans are going to strike it from the RECORD, anyway.

But I am going to say over again, in a more forcible way, everything in that letter before this Congress adjourns. I want Perry S. Heath to answer the questions asked in the letter, and if he does he will be a fit candidate for the penitentiary. I want Perry S. Heath to understand that he is not fooling with an infant when he attacks me. [Laughter.] I want him to understand that I am responsible for all I say. He had no compunction of conscience in wantonly, criminally, and maliciously attacking me in a political campaign, in order to change the opinion of a few voters of this country, and when I tell the truth about him let him meet the charges like a man and not squeal worse than a pig under a gate. [Laughter.]

Mr. Speaker, let this letter be stricken from the RECORD. I care not now. It is in the RECORD; it is in the newspapers of the country. I intended that it should go in the RECORD; I made that fight yesterday. I have accomplished my purpose and I am perfectly content now; for the present, at all events. Mr. Heath has now something to think about. [Applause.]

Mr. KNOX. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion, reported to the House from the Committee of the Whole, that the letter referred to, which is found on page 2527 of the RECORD, be stricken from the RECORD.

The motion was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The ayes have it, the motion prevails, and accordingly the letter referred to will be stricken from the RECORD.

CENTENNIAL OF LOUISIANA PURCHASE.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 9829) to provide for celebrating the one hundredth anniversary of the purchase of the Louisiana territory by the United States by holding an international exhibition in the city of St. Louis, Mo., which bill has been reported to the House by the Special Committee on the Centennial of the Louisiana Purchase, and that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota, chairman of the committee on the celebration of the Louisiana purchase, by direction of his committee, asks unanimous consent for the present

consideration in the House as in Committee of the Whole of the bill which the Clerk will now report to the House.

Mr. TAWNEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the substitute reported by the committee be read instead of the original bill.

The SPEAKER. Coupled with his request, the gentleman makes the request that the substitute reported by the committee for the original bill be read and considered instead of the original bill. Before unanimous consent, the Clerk will report the substitute, if there is no objection.

There was no objection.

The Clerk proceeded with the reading of the substitute.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, to save time I will say that I think this bill ought to go to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. I have no desire to oppose its consideration, if considered in that manner.

The SPEAKER. The request of the gentleman from Minnesota was that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. But, Mr. Speaker, I understand very well what the effect of that is. The bill can not be amended. The previous question can be moved, and therefore I am constrained to object.

Mr. TAWNEY. I will say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that there is no purpose on the part of the special committee to interfere to cut off any amendment that any member of the House may desire to offer, if the bill is considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have no desire—

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Minnesota withdraw that part of his request, that it be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

Mr. TAWNEY. I will withdraw that and let it be considered in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will proceed with the reading.

Mr. HULL. Has unanimous consent been given, Mr. Speaker?

Mr. CANNON. I want to say that if this is to be considered in Committee of the Whole, in my judgment it had better be considered a little later, after the Army and sundry civil bills have passed the House. We have arrived at the stage in the session where I believe those bills ought to be in the Senate.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois object?

Mr. CANNON. To going into Committee of the Whole now to consider the bill? Yes.

The SPEAKER. To the request of the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. CANNON. Well, that is his request, as I understand it. I will not object as soon as the Army bill and the sundry civil bill can be sent to the Senate.

Mr. TAWNEY. I desire to appeal to the gentleman from Illinois to allow this matter to be considered at this time. I am satisfied it will not consume to exceed an hour of the time of the House or of the Committee of the Whole.

Mr. CANNON. Well, it is not of such importance as the bills to carry on the Government, that require forty times as much work, and therefore I shall object until these two bills pass.

Mr. TAWNEY. That may all be true. I hope the gentleman will withdraw his objection.

Mr. CANNON. I will not withdraw the objection at this time until those bills have passed.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the bill making appropriation for the support of the Army.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa moves that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union for the purpose of considering the Army appropriation bill, being the bill H. R. 14017.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Speaker, pending that I desire to say to the House that the majority and minority members of the committee have conferred as to time, and have agreed among themselves for an hour and twenty minutes debate on a side, and I ask unanimous consent that the general debate run for two hours and forty minutes.

The SPEAKER. Pending the motion to go into Committee of the Whole the gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that general debate be closed in two hours and forty minutes.

Mr. HULL. One half to be controlled by myself, the other half by a member of the minority of the Committee on Military Affairs.

The SPEAKER. One half to be controlled by the gentleman from Iowa, chairman of the committee, and the other half to be controlled by a member of the minority of the Committee on Mil-

itary Affairs. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered. The question now is on the motion of the gentleman from Iowa.

The question was put; and the motion was agreed to.

The House accordingly resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, Mr. SHERMAN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of an appropriation bill the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14017) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, if members of the committee will send for the report on this bill they will see that the committee have been compelled to practically make a new estimate, and not be guided by the estimates submitted to Congress by the War Department. The estimates were made on the basis of an army of 65,000 men, the regular establishment, while the bill for the better organization of the Army, as passed by Congress, provides for an Army of a maximum strength of 100,000 men. We had hearings, a copy of which each member of the Committee of the Whole can get if he desires it. The different heads of the bureaus of the War Department submitted new estimates on the larger Army in the hearings; and this bill practically gives for the support of the Army on the basis of the law passed by this Congress. There are but few new provisions in this bill subject to a point of order, and I would prefer calling attention to them as we come to them, for fear I should overlook all the changes in making a general statement. They are very minor matters, and only of such character as commend themselves to the unanimous vote of the Committee on Military Affairs, and I believe will meet the unanimous approval of this committee, with possibly one or two exceptions.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to take up the time of the committee at this time, and reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. HULL. Certainly.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Can the gentleman give the House any idea as to how much is carried in the various other appropriation bills which would be directly chargeable to the support of the Army—in the sundry civil and in the legislative, executive, and judicial?

Mr. HULL. My understanding is that very little is carried in those bills for the support of the Army. The deficiency bill will carry something to provide for the balance of the fiscal year ending June 30, 1901.

Mr. McCLELLAN. The general deficiency bill?

Mr. HULL. I do not recall whether that or the urgent deficiency bill passed for this fiscal year. And I will say that the general deficiency bill will have a few items, as we have got in new estimates since this bill was reported. We could not have any deficiencies for the support of the Army proper for this year, for the reason that there can be no deficiency for the year we are now legislating for until we meet in next December.

Mr. McCLELLAN. In other words, the items carried in the sundry civil and the legislative bill would cover all the items for next year?

Mr. HULL. For the next year.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Iowa now yield the floor?

Mr. HULL. I yield the floor.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I yield twenty-five minutes to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, although what I have to say is not entirely pertinent to this bill and might better have been spoken while the pension bill was under consideration, I still conceive it to be my duty to call the attention of the House to an evil the magnitude of which has at least been made apparent to every member of the Committee on Military Affairs, and which is growing rapidly.

The particular evil to which I am trying to direct the attention of the House is a fine illustration of how the good nature of members, or carelessness, or indifference to the public welfare will lead them to offer bills here which they neither indorse in their conscience nor approve with their judgment. The Committee on Military Affairs is fairly choked with bills of this character proposing to correct the record of soldiers of the civil war who are written down on the books of the War Department as deserters.

Men who deserted before April, 1865, and who, in most cases,

have been quite content to endure the stigma of the written record, are now coming by the thousands to a generous or careless Congress to have their sins washed away by special acts. One would be inclined to have a better opinion of his fellow-men if he could believe that this was an awakening of conscience or even the stirring of a long dormant pride. We could not help feeling some sympathy for a man whose spirit had chafed for nearly thirty-six years under the shameful charge of being a deserter. We would pity his unfortunate condition and might be inclined to recommend legislative relief. Certainly we would listen with patience to his cry for help.

But, Mr. Chairman, the history of these cases does not warrant the belief that these bills are inspired by an honest desire to bequeath an untarnished name to the children of the petitioners.

All sorts of pleas are set up by the rascals who had neither the courage nor the patriotism to do their duty in war. Of course they nearly all claim that they are innocent. Some of them admit technical desertion, but plead sickness or ignorance as an excuse for desertion. Yet it is a curious fact that men who deserted because, as they say, they were too young or too stupid to know that it was wrong to leave the Army without a discharge almost unfailingly displayed enough cunning to elude the authorities until the bar of limitation operated for their protection.

Then, it is not an awakening of conscience nor the stirring of a long dormant pride which has caused this flood of special-relief bills to be offered here. But it is knowledge of the fact that the crimes of youth and idiocy have erected a barrier between them and the United States Treasury.

Almost without exception—so far as I know, without a single exception—these character-cleaning bills are the first steps of a procession of cowardly scoundrels by way of the Pension Bureau to the Treasury.

There has been referred to the Committee on Military Affairs during this Congress about 2,300 private bills. Of these 2,300 bills about 2,000 are for the removal of the charge of desertion against soldiers who served in the war between the States. Nearly all of the remaining 300 private bills are to give rank to officers who were not properly mustered. It appears that the governors of the States frequently commissioned officers to fill vacancies that did not exist, as, for instance, when an officer resigned or was killed, a commission would at once be issued to a new man, whether or not the regiment had a sufficient number of men to entitle it, under the statutes, to a full complement of officers.

These also are the flimsy basis for a persistent raid upon the Treasury.

The Committee on Military Affairs have two subcommittees to consider desertion bills.

Each of the subcommittees has before it about a thousand bills intended to remove the charge of desertion from would-be pensioners.

In nearly every one of these cases a record has been received from the War Department, and it has been carefully considered. Out of all these 2,000 cases only 32 have been found worthy a report; and even in these 32 cases it is a question if the sympathy of the committee has not been so moved that a claimant has been given the benefit of a doubt.

I mean no reflection upon the committee. The gentlemen who compose it are conscientious, hard-working men. They try to do right, but they are besieged by members who have bills there upon which they want a report. They would be more than human if some time they did not so far yield to the importunities of their colleagues as to take a view of the evidence in these cases which they would not take if left absolutely alone.

These measures are usually entitled, "A bill to correct the record of," etc.

Members do not stop to consider that what they call "correcting a record" is reviewing the proceedings of one of the statutory courts of the country, for such the courts-martial are, and that they are asking the reversal of a judgment arrived at after a fair and impartial trial while the crime was new and the evidence all at hand.

Congress might, perhaps, enact a law reversing the decision of a Federal district court, and thereby enable a criminal to avoid a righteously-imposed judgment; but by no stretch of the imagination could we call it "correcting the record."

It would be a more accurate description of the procedure if we should call it "tampering with justice."

Gentlemen urge that it is necessary now and then to pass these special bills to relieve certain worthy people whose cases do not come within the purview of the general law.

Mr. Chairman, there is nothing in this claim. The Congress has provided relief by a series of extravagantly liberal laws.

There is no soldier in this whole country who is charged with desertion, whose claim for relief has the shadowest sort of foundation, who can not have the stain upon his character cleaned up by application to the Secretary of War.

I hope I may have the attention of gentlemen while I call attention to the laws.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. Can the gentleman say what the reason is for the distinction in the law between soldiers of the Regular Army and volunteers?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I can not.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. I think that is a matter that should be corrected.

Mr. SLAYDEN. My colleague upon the committee [Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota] offers a solution of that question, and I will yield to him to answer the question of the gentleman.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, as I understand why there is a difference in the law between soldiers who served in the Regular Army and those who served in the volunteers it is this: As I understand, those who served in the Regular Army enlisted as a trade, as a matter of business; those who served in the volunteer did it as a matter of patriotism.

Mr. SLAYDEN. And of sentiment.

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. And that this liberality should be extended to the volunteers, as it is expected that the regulars will serve out their term, where the volunteers frequently do not serve out their time.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. Is desertion any more excusable in the one case than the other?

Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota. Yes; it may be; because the volunteers have families and they have business relations.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I will have to resume my time.

The act of August 7, 1882, provided that the charge of desertion against any soldier might be removed by the Secretary of War when it was established to his satisfaction that such soldier had served faithfully for the term of his enlistment or until the 22d day of May, 1863, even though he was absent from his command at the time the same was mustered out.

He can also, under the same act, have his record corrected by the Secretary of War when it can be shown that he did not intend to desert, and that he voluntarily returned to his command after the charge of desertion had been made.

Mr. GILBERT. Has that ever been done?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Often.

The act of July 5, 1884, gave the Secretary of War still greater discretion in the matter of relieving soldiers from the charge of desertion and made the law still more liberal.

The law of May 17, 1886, went still further and provided that the soldier who deserted one command and joined another should not be borne upon the rolls as a deserter, provided it could be shown that he did not receive a bounty upon his second enlistment.

An act approved August 14, 1888, provided with extreme liberality for the relief of the enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps against whom there was standing the charge of desertion.

But these acts, liberal as they were to men who had committed one of the highest crimes known to military laws, did not measure the generosity of Congress. By the law of March 2, 1889, the avenue of escape from the disgraceful charge of desertion was made still broader.

There remains but one step to be taken, if we are to go further in this matter of relieving deserters from the consequences of their crime, and that is to provide that desertion is not a crime and shall not operate as a bar to pensions.

Mr. Chairman, the tax upon the people of this country for the purpose of paying pensions is hard enough at best. To ask them to support out of the public Treasury a horde of skulkers and runaways is to exhaust the patience of even the good-natured long-suffering taxpayer.

It has been well said that the pension list should be a roll of honor. Can it be called one when it is made possible for every camp follower and cowardly deserter to have his name enrolled with that of the brave and unfortunate soldier who always did his duty?

I invite the attention of the House to one or two specimen relief bills: H. R. 5129 is "A bill to remove the charge of desertion and grant an honorable discharge to John A. Emison, late of Company D, Fifth Indiana Cavalry."

The record furnished the committee by the Bureau so admirably and efficiently presided over by General Ainsworth shows that Emison enlisted August 1, 1862, and was mustered in September 5, 1862, and that he deserted March 11, 1863, at Glasgow, Ky.

Six months of service was enough to kill the patriotism and dissipate the martial ardor of the gallant hero. The record further says that he was arrested September 23, about six months later, at Lexington, Ky., by the provost-marshal of the Seventh Congressional district.

The Government evidently needed troops about that time, for

he was, it appears, permitted to enlist again. The record continues:

He again deserted June 1, 1864, at Cartersville, Ga. He never again returned to his command or reported his whereabouts to the military authorities of the United States, although his company remained in service until June 5, 1865.

Now for another sample of the sort of people for whom you are expected to pass special acts:

H. R. 11990 is a bill to remove the charge of desertion and to grant an honorable discharge to John Barron.

The war records show that he was—

Mustered into service as a private in Company D, Third Maryland Infantry, September 12, 1861; that he deserted January 1, 1863, and that he was arrested in Washington, D. C., July 28, 1863. He was admitted to the Stone Hospital, in this city, the next day for the treatment of syphilis. He returned to duty November 5, 1863. He was then confined in the Forest Hall Prison under the double charge of being a deserter and a blackmailer. He was released from prison December 9, 1863, and the charge of desertion removed by Special Orders, No. 544, from the Adjutant-General's Office, War Department, Washington, D. C.

I continue to quote from the record:

He rejoined his regiment December 19, 1863, and reenlisted as a veteran January 5, 1864, and was wounded in the left foot—second and third toes—June 17, 1864. He was sent to the hospital and furloughed July 26, 1864.

Having first been in the hospital, then the prison, and then the hospital again, one might be inclined to think that gallant John Barron had been put into a good physical condition and was now really ready to do his duty and a soldier's work.

But the record continues as follows:

He returned August 24, 1864, and was again furloughed October 11, 1864. He returned from his furlough October 31, 1864, and is reported as on duty January 10, 1865. He is reported on the muster roll of his company dated February 28, 1865, as present and under arrest. He was tried by court-martial, from records and findings of which the following is an extract:

"John Barron, private, Company D, Third Maryland Battalion Veteran Volunteer Infantry, was arraigned before a general court-martial which convened at headquarters First Division, Ninth Army Corps, March 17, 1865, upon the following charges and specifications:

"Charge first: Self-mutilation.

"Specification: In this, that Private John Barron, D Company, Third Maryland Battalion Veteran Volunteer Infantry, did shoot himself in the foot intentionally while in the rear skulking out of the fight in which the regiment was engaged, on or about the 17th day of June, 1864.

"Charge second: Cowardice.

"Specification: In this that said John Barron, private, D Company, Third Maryland Battalion Veteran Volunteer Infantry, did act in a cowardly manner by skulking out of the fight in which the regiment was engaged June 17, 1864, and was not present in any fight during the campaign.

"He was found guilty of the charges and specifications, and was thereupon sentenced to be shot to death with musketry at such time and place as the commanding general may direct, two-thirds of the members concurring therein.

"C. K. PIER,

"Lieutenant-Colonel Thirty-eighth Wisconsin Volunteers,
"President of General Court-Martial.

"JOSEPH O. BELLAIR,

"Captain Company F, First Michigan Sharpshooters,
"Judge-Advocate."

"The findings are approved. But I respectfully recommend mitigation of the sentence to the forfeiture of all pay and emoluments, discharge, and confinement at hard labor until the close of the war.

"O. B. WILLCOX,

"Brevet Major-General, Commanding."

"The proceedings and findings in the foregoing case are approved.

"The sentence is mitigated as follows: To be dishonorably discharged from the service of the United States at once, with forfeiture of all pay and allowances now due or to become due him, and to be confined at hard labor for the period of three years in such penitentiary as the Secretary of War shall direct.

"JNO. G. PARKE,

"Major-General, Commanding.

"HEADQUARTERS DEPARTMENT OF WASHINGTON,

"June 17, 1865."

The sentence of the general court-martial was approved in special orders, of which the following is an extract copy:

SPECIAL ORDERS,

No. 348.

WAR DEPARTMENT,

ADJUTANT-GENERAL'S OFFICE,

Washington, July 3, 1865.

24. The sentence of the general court-martial, "to be shot to death," as commuted, "to be dishonorably discharged the service of the United States at once, with forfeiture of all pay and allowances now due or to become due him, and be confined at hard labor for the period of three years in such penitentiary as the Secretary of War may direct," in the case of Private John Barron, Company D, Third Maryland Battalion Veteran Volunteers, as promulgated in General Orders, No. —, Headquarters, Department of Washington, of June 17, 1865, is approved, and the State prison at Concord, N. H., is designated as the place of confinement, to which place the prisoner will be sent under proper guard without delay.

The Quartermaster's Department will furnish the necessary transportation.

By order of the Secretary of War:

E. D. TOWNSEND,

Assistant Adjutant-General.

If ever a man did need the aid of Congress to burnish up his character that man is Private John Barron, of Company D, Third Maryland Infantry. A deserter, he was arrested in Washington, suffering with a loathsome disease. Imprisoned as a deserter and blackmailer, he is released only to turn up again as a skulking coward, who mutilated himself to keep out of battle. Sentenced to be shot, he had the great good fortune to have his sentence

mitigated to a dishonorable discharge and three years' imprisonment.

Can Congress give relief to such a man? I think not. Indeed, I think it would strain the plan of salvation to wash away the sins of Private John Barron. Yet, if this bill should pass, he will surely ask for a pension, and will no doubt plead that his loathsome disease was contracted and his toes lost in the line of duty.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Is that a bill that has passed the House?

Mr. SLAYDEN. No.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Then why—

Mr. SLAYDEN. I decline to yield, not because I do not want to answer any questions, but because my time has about run out.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. You can get plenty of time.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman from Texas yield to me for a question?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I will yield to my colleague on the committee.

Mr. MONDELL. I want to ask if the Committee on Military Affairs has not refused absolutely to consider cases of this character?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I explained, I thought, elaborately and clearly that these were specimen cases of the bills sent to the committee, and I also stated that only 32 had been found worthy of relief and had been reported. I positively assert that these cases were not among the 32. I also stated that I had not seen one of the 32 cases that I thought ought to be approved by the committee; and my colleagues will bear me out when I say that my course there has been consistently against these desertion bills.

These are specimen cases, Mr. Chairman. The Committee on Military Affairs has been asked to consider during this Congress more than 2,000 such.

The inspiration of all these bills is a desire to get on the pension roll.

Since the close of the civil war the taxpayers of this country have been called upon to pay \$2,598,373,105 for pensions.

The annual pension bill recently passed by this House was, in round figures, \$145,000,000. Shall we swell this stupendous sum by adding to the list of those who receive the largess of the people all the rogues, skulkers, and deserters who were occasionally in the armies of the Government during the civil war?

To do so would be an affront to every honest soldier, would be unjust to every worthy pensioner, and an outrage upon that forgotten man, the American taxpayer.

The provisions of the general law are ample to afford relief to every soldier who has any claim to the consideration of Congress. The man whose case is not covered by these extravagantly liberal laws is simply a deserter, and should forever bear the brand of his shame. [Applause.]

Mr. ESCH. In the absence of the chairman of the committee I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I do not desire five minutes, but I do desire just time enough to dissent wholly and entirely from the conclusions of the gentleman from Texas. The cases he has stated here are extreme cases—cases I would not vote for. They never have seen the light of day; they are not on the Calendar; they are cases not considered by the committee, and I commend the gentleman for his wisdom and prudence in not recommending the passage of such bills as he has read.

But, Mr. Chairman, I know of men who are technically deserters, who after the service of a year or two in the Army found they were deserters technically by overstaying on sick leave, and reenlisted and served during the war; and in cases of that kind, where there is a technical charge of desertion against them, it ought to be removed. If the law is not sufficient to remove such charges, it ought to be made so. I would not have men who did not serve honorably in the war receive any benefit, but I would not have an innocent and loyal soldier suffer. We can afford to be just.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Has the gentleman read the general law applicable to the subject?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. Yes; and I do not think it adequate to cover cases such as I mention.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Can the gentleman suggest any extension that ought to be made in the general law?

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I do not think deserters should be rewarded or relieved from disability, but if a man is technically a deserter and reenlisted in the service of his country and served loyally, as many soldiers did, the charge ought to be removed.

Mr. SLAYDEN. But the general law amply provides for that now.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. The law does not adequately make such provision.

Mr. SLAYDEN. It does so, amply and adequately.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I do not think it does.

I rose, Mr. Chairman, for the sole purpose of emphasizing the fact that extreme cases, such as those cited by the gentleman from

Texas, are not a fair criterion, and that all applicants for the removal of charges of desertion ought not to be included in the class in which the gentleman is seeking to put them. I entirely dissent from his view. I commend the gentleman's zeal; I know how fair and honorable he is in dealing with matters of this kind; but I do not believe it is right to single out a few cases and then brand the whole of this class as unworthy the consideration of the American Congress.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SLAYDEN. May I have two or three minutes?

Mr. ESCH. I yield the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, I was unfortunate in not making myself clear when I stated, as I tried to state distinctly, that these were sample bills taken out of the box containing more than 2,000. I will say further, Mr. Chairman, that within the thirty-six years that have elapsed since the close of the civil war and under a series of statutes of the most absurdly liberal sort, there is no reason why any man who unjustly bears the stigma of desertion should not have had it removed years ago.

Mr. GILBERT. But, Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. GILBERT. Suppose the Secretary of War, upon inspection of these ex parte affidavits filed, should decide wrongfully, and the committee before whom the same application comes, inspecting the same affidavits, should come to the conclusion that the Secretary of War has misjudged the case, and that the man was a meritorious soldier, why should not Congress consider that class of claims?

Mr. SLAYDEN. In the first place, meritorious soldiers do not desert, and in the second place—

Mr. GILBERT. The gentleman's entire argument seems to be predicated upon the proposition that the Secretary of War is infallible and will decide every case properly. May he not, as every other man is liable to do, decide a case improperly?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I will ask the gentleman whether he does not think it likely that a decision arrived at more than thirty years ago, when the evidence was at hand and the crime was fresh, is much more apt to be correct than a decision of a Congress that is appealed to thirty-six or thirty-seven years afterwards, upon an ex parte statement of the proposed beneficiary of our legislation?

Mr. GILBERT. I know instances where soldiers are technically deserters, and where the affidavits have been filed repeatedly year in and year out before the War Department, and uniformly turned down.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I think it very likely that when the Department has uniformly "turned down" such affidavits it has done so for some good reason. My observation of the administration of the War Department is that it is impartial, that it is conducted with a view to scrupulously guarding the honor of the service—

Mr. GILBERT. Unquestionably.

Mr. SLAYDEN. With the view of rewarding the meritorious and inflicting just punishment upon those who deserve punishment.

Mr. GILBERT. Certainly; but, like every other man, the Secretary of War, acting as a judge, may make mistakes.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. I have an instance in my mind now. The gentleman from Texas says that the lapse of over thirty years ought to be a bar to these applications. In the case which I have in mind a young man entered the service. At that time he was not married. After coming out of the service he married, and has children. Now, for the sake of clearing his military record, in order that his children may not have an unjust stigma upon them, he comes to Congress for relief. Is there any more appropriate forum than this to do justice to deserving soldiers?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I want to say that I have not declared in any instance, and I do not declare now, that I am opposed to the removal of these charges in meritorious cases. I only say that I have failed to find such a case.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON] has such a case.

Mr. CLAYTON of Alabama. I can give the gentleman a deserving case. I would like to state the circumstances.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Texas yield?

Mr. SLAYDEN. Oh, yes; if I have the time.

Mr. CLAYTON of Alabama. There is now pending before the gentleman's committee a bill proposing to remove the charge of desertion against Michael I. Prior. He enlisted and served in the Union Army. He was absent from his command for some time—I have forgotten how long. He afterwards appeared and reenlisted, I think, in another command. The proof was, as he informed me—and I believe it to be the case—that he was sick and could not get back to his command in time. Now, does not the gentleman think that the law ought to be such that this man can have the charge of desertion removed? The gentleman has undertaken to indict all these soldiers against whom this charge has been entered. I think his sweeping indictment is wrong.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. So do I.

Mr. CLAYTON of Alabama. But if any soldier has been improperly charged with desertion, how can he get relief except by legislation of this character?

Mr. SLAYDEN. The War Department has the right, under the law, to remedy cases of this kind when it is applied to.

Mr. ESCH. Only in those cases, however, which come within the letter of the law.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I have a case before the Committee on Military Affairs which is a sample case, I imagine, of desertion. The circumstances are about these—I am speaking now, of course, of the military record of the man: He went into the service and served throughout the war, or for about four years, until about May or June—say until May or June, 1865.

Mr. SLAYDEN (interrupting). He served during that whole time?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Yes; he served during that whole time. He served from the commencement of the war until about June, 1865. The war was then over; the discipline of the service had greatly relaxed, and this man came from the service and, with some relatives or friends, got on a sort of a "jamboree." Subsequently he was arrested and put into the guardhouse. While in the guardhouse and under the charge for which he was arrested he deserted. Now, the question is, was the man technically a deserter or not? That is a question which the law does not define. It is a question which Congress must act upon. The war was over; the soldiers were being released as fast as possible; and I would like to ask the gentleman in what category he would place this man. I cite this only as an instance of the many cases which must arise under the operation of our law, where such a vast number of men were engaged in the service.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I make no question as to the suggestion of the gentleman. I am speaking now of the general law, which seems to be broad enough to cover nearly all these cases. If there is a specific case which can not be covered by the general law, that presents another question.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. The general law would not cover a case of this kind.

Mr. CAPRON. He deserted while under arrest?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Yes.

Mr. CAPRON. And now asks that the charge of desertion be removed?

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Yes; and there is no other place where he can apply.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The misfortune is, if the gentleman will permit me, that the Department has not power to grant relief when there is a technical desertion. The House alone can authorize the Department to grant relief in a number of these cases. There ought to be a general law covering such cases and authorizing the Department to grant relief.

Mr. CAPRON. But if the man did not desert?

Mr. SLAYDEN. The House in 1839 passed a law—or Congress passed a law—that the War Department was authorized to remove the charge of desertion from every man who was not more than four continuous months in desertion.

Mr. CLAYTON of Alabama. And who had been in continuous service for the time fixed by the law.

Mr. CAPRON. And that is the case here, as I understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Michigan three minutes, if he desires the time.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I do not like to sit here without some protest against what I think to be an injustice to a class of our old soldiers. I have no sympathy, so far as I am concerned, with deserters. On the contrary, I believe that any man who deserts his command should receive the severest punishment. But the report in this case, and the citations of the gentleman from Texas who has addressed the House in reference to it, show this man was suffering from syphilis; that he wounded himself to keep out of battle; that he was tried after his desertion by a court-martial, and was condemned to be shot for the crime of desertion. Now, the gentleman, as I understand him, has cited this as what he calls a "sample case." And the gentleman reiterated it and repeated that statement over and over again. He has suggested this as a "fair sample" of the cases pending before the Department and which are brought here for our action.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Will the gentleman permit a correction?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. The gentleman stated time and time again—

Mr. SLAYDEN. If the gentleman will allow me, I have only suggested that there were many cases of this character.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman, I can not yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I have only said that these were specimens of the cases which come before us.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I believe I have the floor, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is entitled to the floor.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. And I propose to proceed in my own way.

Now, I do not by any means agree to the suggestion that these are "sample cases."

Mr. SLAYDEN. Is this not a fair illustration of the cases of men who are seeking relief?

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I do not think so. But why should the gentleman haggle about it?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I am not haggling about it.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. You say that a man who had syphilis, who was diseased, and was condemned to be shot is a fair sample of the cases of desertions which come before this body?

Mr. SLAYDEN. I have said nothing of the kind. The gentleman entirely misunderstands my position.

I have specifically stated—and the gentleman does not seem to comprehend the statement—that each one of the 2,300 or 2,500 cases which come before this body is different in detail from each other one which has been presented.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. And that it is a fair sample.

Mr. SLAYDEN. I do not say that everyone of these twenty-three hundred men had shot away his toes or contracted a loathsome disease. I do not say that the cases were identical.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. No; but you said this is a sample of twenty-three hundred cases.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Oh, yes; of 2,000.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Nobody said you asserted they were identical; but you did declare that they were fair samples.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Well, I said samples; yes, I say, of those that I have seen.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I say they are not fair samples, judging from my knowledge of the men.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Well, the gentleman perhaps has a more intimate knowledge of deserters than I have; I do not know.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I know young men who were urged out of the Army by friends at home. When I was in the ranks I heard the letters read from sympathizers with the men who were seeking to shoot them down, saying: "Come home; we will protect you." Such letters were written to minors.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ESCH. I yield to the gentleman five minutes.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Those were the men who were urged to desert from the Union Army by the sympathizers of those who were against the Union, urging them to come home. I heard letters read from parents and friends, saying, "Come home; we will protect you." Those letters were sent to soldiers in the ranks. They did not have the syphilis; they did not shoot their toes off; they were pure young men, worthy men, induced by home influences to get out of the Army, and yet you say these are to be classed with those that you speak of as being fair samples. I say they are not, and you cast an aspersion not upon honorable men, but upon men on whose record there is a stain, and I hesitate with you to remove that stain. I have no more sympathy than you with the men who deserted the flag and who failed to do their duty as soldiers; but you make a sweeping and uncalled-for and in my judgment an untruthful assertion when you say that the case you cited is a fair sample or anything like it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman's insinuation that I have made an untruthful—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York is entitled to the floor if he demands it.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The gentleman's insinuation—

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York [Mr. SULZER] yield to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. SULZER. I yield to the gentleman from Texas two minutes.

Mr. SLAYDEN. The gentleman's insinuation that I have made an untruthful statement here in regard to this matter is either conceived in the densest ignorance or is a deliberate attempt, regardless of truth, to affront a fellow-member—I do not know which. Mr. Chairman, I have not read every one of the twenty-two or twenty-three hundred bills in the committee room intended to remove the charge of desertion from these people, but I do know that more than thirty-five years have elapsed since the close of the war. I do know that there are a series of statutes of a very liberal sort providing a means by which these charges of desertion may be removed. I do know, Mr. Chairman, from repeated conversations with men who commanded those deserters, men who are now serving the country eminently, men with a distinguished character, that they do not ask and that the service does not ask and that no one else should ask that any such bills as these should pass. I do know that this class of legislation not only does not receive the sympathy of the men who command the armies of the United States or the men who administer the affairs of the War Department, but that when they venture to express their opinions in a

private way they speak of it with contempt as a species of legislation unwarranted by the facts and, in a degree, a reflection upon the worthy soldier who did his duty to the ringing down of the curtain. The gentleman's insinuation that I have interest enough in this matter to tell an untruth about it is cowardly and false.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SLAYDEN. Deserters do not come from my section of the country and nobody from there is on the pension roll or trying to get on.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Texas does not desire to occupy the rest of his time?

Mr. SLAYDEN. No, sir.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman yields it back to the gentleman from New York. The gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. ESCH] is now entitled to the floor.

Mr. ESCH. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. I do not want to be misunderstood in this matter. The gentleman gave a specific case as a sample. He does not face the music. He fires all around the bush—

Mr. SLAYDEN. The gentleman can not play any tune that I am not willing to face.

Mr. GARDNER of Michigan. He fires all around the bush, but seeks to avoid confessing that he stated a sample case. I say now, as I said before, if that is a sample case, in my judgment—mark you, in my judgment—it is untrue. If that is cowardly, I am willing to accept being called a coward. I have faced your people on many battlefields and have yet to be charged with being a coward. [Loud applause.] They did not put that against me when I was a lad, and I came from a section of country where they do not need or deserve that charge, but they stood by the flag and saved the country under which you live to-day. [Renewed applause.] If that is cowardly, make the best of it.

I am not here to defend deserters. As I said before, I have no use for them on either side. But if the records were true, there were as many proportionately on the one side as on the other. They were not a credit to either army. I say when you or any man charges that a man who had syphilis, who shot himself to keep out of battle, is a fair sample or a sample of the men who deserted, I say I do not believe it is true.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. PACKER of Pennsylvania having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House of Representatives by Mr. PRUDEN, one of his secretaries, who also informed the House that the President had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

On February 8, 1901:

H. R. 9185. An act granting an increase of pension to Horace L. Stiles;

H. R. 11548. An act to authorize the Kingston Bridge Company to construct a bridge across the Clinch River at Kingston, Tenn.;

H. R. 10921. An act granting to Keokuk and Hamilton Water Power Company right to construct and maintain wing dam, canal, and power station in the Mississippi River in Hancock County, Ill.; and

H. R. 13399. An act for the establishment of a beacon light on Hambrook Bar, Choptank River, Maryland, and for other purposes.

On February 11, 1901:

H. R. 13371. An act to authorize advances from the Treasury of the United States for the support of the government of the District of Columbia; and

H. R. 12513. An act to extend the privileges of the seventh section of the immediate-transportation act to Saginaw, Mich.

On February 12, 1901:

H. R. 11970. An act to authorize the Chattahoochee and Gulf Railroad Company, of Alabama, to construct a bridge across the Choctawhatchee River, a navigable stream in Geneva County, Ala.;

H. R. 13491. An act authorizing the Mount Carmel Development Company to draw water from Wabash River at Grand Rapids, Wabash County, Ill.;

H. R. 971. An act to authorize the purchase of a steam launch for use in the customs collection district of Galveston, Tex.; and

H. R. 13606. An act authorizing the establishment of a first-order light at or near Hillsboro Point, Florida.

ARMY APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. ESCH. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BOUTELL].

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, the remarks of the

gentleman from Texas carried—unintentionally, I am sure—to every member, I think, who heard him some slight reflection upon the good judgment of members of this House who have introduced these bills for the correction of military records. Now, I think we ought to take into consideration that as a lawyer will sometimes file a praecipe, but when he knows all the facts will decline to file a declaration, so these bills for the correction of military records are filed by members of the House on the mere statement of the beneficiary, without full knowledge of the facts of the case. I am sure that the gentlemen who introduced the two bills referred to by the gentleman from Texas would be the first to insist that those bills and all bills showing a similar state of facts should be unfavorably reported.

So I think, Mr. Chairman, that the mere fact that there are a large number of unmeritorious bills before the Committee on Military Affairs does not in any way reflect upon the good judgment of the members of the House who introduced the bills without a full knowledge of the circumstances connected with the different cases.

This discussion has, however, raised, Mr. Chairman, one point which I think is of great importance, and I will illustrate it by one bill which I introduced to correct the military record of a friend and neighbor of mine. The law approved March 2, 1889, confers some discretion upon the War Department in removing these charges of desertion, and contains in the first section authority for the Secretary of War to remove the charge of desertion in the case of volunteers who were absent either by sickness or had absented themselves from their command at the date of mustering out, or at the expiration of the term of their enlistment.

Now, it will be noticed, Mr. Chairman, that that section is limited to soldiers in the volunteer service, and does not extend that discretion to soldiers who enlisted in the regular establishment. My attention was recently called to this case. A gentleman in my district, whom I have known for over twenty years, an honorable member of the community, a man with a family of grown-up children, a man who has held elective and appointive offices of responsibility in his own community, presented these facts to me: He enlisted in the Regular Army in October, 1864, when barely 14 years of age. In order to enlist, he had to elude his parents, and so he enlisted under an assumed name. His parents discovered his whereabouts. His father brought proceedings in habeas corpus before the United States court. The judge ordered the lieutenant under whom this boy was serving to bring the boy into court.

The boy, the record shows, was reprimanded by the judge for enlisting under an assumed name. He was then discharged, and the judge told him that he might go with his parents or go with the lieutenant. The boy still chose to enter the service. He went with the lieutenant, and from October, 1864, he served until the 21st of June, 1865, two months after the cessation of hostilities. At that time the boy, ill with chronic diarrhea and dysentery, was taken home. His father told him that the war being at an end it was unnecessary for him to return, and that he would see that his record was correctly made. That boy was marked as a deserter. Under the law—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ESCH. I yield the gentleman three minutes more.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois. Under the law which I have quoted, if that boy had been in the volunteer service the Secretary of War could have corrected his record and given him an honorable discharge; but because this boy, who wished to serve his country, and took an assumed name for the purpose of escaping from his parents, and served for nearly one year in the Regular Army, until two months after the cessation of hostilities, was in the regular establishment and not in the volunteer service the Secretary of War can not give him an honorable discharge. I have here a copy of that law, with one amendment in red ink written by one of the highest officials in the War Department, suggesting a change which, in his judgment, should be made in the law to cover such cases. The amendment has not been made, and I presented a bill to this House for consideration to correct this soldier's record; and notwithstanding the gentleman from Texas is determined to vote consistently, as he says, against all these bills, I submit confidently to this House and to the country that the record of that boy should be corrected the same as that of a volunteer soldier, and that Congress should grant him an honorable discharge to hand down to his descendants. This boy was hardly 15 years of age, and the charge of desertion stands against him to-day—an honorable and respected citizen—because he went into the regular establishment and not into the volunteer service.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that this case shows that there may be bills pending among these 2,300 bills, to which the gentleman from Texas refers, which should not only receive the favorable consideration of that committee and the House, but should, Mr. Chairman, receive the speedy approval of Congress in order that justice may be done to honorable men who are bearing the tech-

nical, but no less undeserved, stigma of desertion, before death removes them from the arena where we can do them even tardy justice. [Applause.]

Mr. ESCH. I now yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. CLAYTON].

Mr. CLAYTON of Alabama. Mr. Chairman, I accept the modified statement of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN]. I thought in the first instance he had preferred a wholesale indictment against all the claimants for this sort of legislation, but his subsequent remarks seem to disclaim that idea. The case I had in my mind when I interrupted the gentleman from Texas is now before me and I have the papers in the case, and I want to read as a part of my remarks a statement of it. It is the case of Michael I. Prior, late of Company C, New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, who resides now in the Third district of Alabama, where we would like to have more people from the North and the West to go to live, to help us build up that great section of the country.

Case of Michael I. Prior, late of Company C, New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery.

It is shown by the records that Michael Nolan was enrolled and mustered into service October 21, 1861, as a private in Company C, Second New York Heavy Artillery, to serve three years. He appears to have been present with his company until August 8, 1862, when he deserted, never thereafter returning to his command or reporting his whereabouts or the cause of his absence to the military authorities, although his company remained in service until September 29, 1865. While absent in desertion, he enlisted, June 23, 1863, in violation of the twenty-second (now fiftieth) article of war, under the name Michael I. Prior, and was mustered into service July 9, 1863, as a private in Company M, Fourteenth New York Cavalry Volunteers, to serve three years. He was appointed a corporal, and was present with his company until June 12, 1865, when he was mustered out and honorably discharged the service as a supernumerary.

Applying for removal of the charge of desertion, Michael Nolan, the applicant, declared, in an affidavit, without date, received at this office April 14, 1890, as follows:

"That he is the identical Michael Nolan who was a private in Company C, in the Second Regiment of New York Heavy Artillery; that he served faithfully until on or about the 23d day of August, 1862, when, without any intention of deserting, he left the regiment under the following circumstances: His wife had just arrived in New York City from Ireland and was alone in a strange city. He went to provide her a home in that city until his time had expired, but was taken with heart disease, which he contracted in the service and line of duty, and was sick so long before he could do any duty that he was afraid to return to his command for fear of being shot. He subsequently enlisted, about June 23, 1863, in Company M, Fourteenth New York Cavalry, and was honorably discharged therefrom October 25, 1865."

He reenlisted under the name of Michael J. Prior.

Under the name Michael J. Prior the applicant further testified, July 23, 1896, as follows:

"This is evidently written by himself, and you will see that he is illiterate."

That he served until on or about the 8th day of August, 1862, when, without any intention of deserting, he left the regiment under the following circumstances: "My wife landed in New York City in July, '62, and shortly after landing took arachnias in her head and I left my command not with the intention of desertion but to see her and return within five days while in New York I took heart disease and at times felt so that I could not return to my command at the time when I did get able to return I met lieutenant Smith afterwards captain of M company 14th N Y V C he was recruiting for the said company I told him my case he told me to join his company it made no matter what branch of the service I served in I was then under my mother name Nolan and was raised up to that time by the name of Michl Nolan. He asked me what was my father's name I told him Prior he told me to join his in that name which I did on 23 day June 1863 and was discharged by reason of consolidation the 14th with 18th N Y V C on the 25th of October 1865. The decease I contracted whilst in co c 2d N Y H A to the best of my recollection in June, 1862 was caused by Sun Stroke whilst in the ranks held in review before President Lincoln."

Now, here is what General Ainsworth says:

The application for removal of the charge of desertion in this case has been denied and now stands denied—

Not on the ground that his story is not true—

on the ground that the soldier's absence from the service between the date of his desertion from the Second New York Heavy Artillery and the date of his enlistment in the Fourteenth New York Cavalry exceeded four months, and because the case does not come within any of the other provisions of the act of Congress approved March 2, 1889, which is the only law now in force governing the subject of removal of charges of desertion.

Respectfully submitted.

F. C. AINSWORTH,
Chief Record and Pension Office.

RECORD AND PENSION OFFICE, WAR DEPARTMENT, May 22, 1900.
The SECRETARY OF WAR.

So, Mr. Chairman, it appears that the general law, if I may so express it, or the act of March, 1889, does not cover every meritorious case. If the alleged desertion covers more than four months, the War Department can not remove the charge of desertion in any case. In the case cited it seems not to be doubted that the soldier tells the truth and is worthy of relief asked. I know nothing of the facts. I want the committee to consider the case, and if the facts sustain the claim of Mr. Pryor, then to give him the relief sought. The War Department has denied relief, because, to quote from General Ainsworth—

It is denied on the ground that the soldier's absence from the service between the date of desertion from the Second New York Artillery and the date of the enlistment in the Fourteenth New York Cavalry exceeded four months.

I want to say that this committee, which has not considered this bill, would, as the Pension Committee always does, consider the evidence in the case; and if they found from full investigation of the case that his story was true, then this bill ought to be passed to relieve him.

Mr. McCLELLAN Mr. Chairman, a few minutes ago I asked the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs if he could tell the House how much is carried for the support of the Army on appropriation bills other than that now before us. He was unable to answer my question. I did not expect that he could answer it, for it is almost beyond the power of anybody to make an absolutely correct estimate of the total amount appropriated in any one session for the support of our military establishment.

Under the present system appropriations for the support of the military establishment are carried on five regular appropriation bills, as well as on the various deficiency bills that come before us. Items of appropriation directly chargeable to the Army are hidden away in paragraphs that suggest no possible connection with military matters. Two different committees, that of which the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] is chairman and the Committee on Appropriations, appropriate for the service. The Committee on Military Affairs has jurisdiction only over the Military Academy appropriations and the so-called Army appropriation bill, that contains such items as the Committee on Appropriations has permitted it to insert. Should, however, the Army bill fail to appropriate enough for current expenses, and should a deficiency appropriation be necessary, then the Committee on Military Affairs loses entire control of the matter and the Committee on Appropriations usurps the shadow of power originally possessed by the Committee on Military Affairs.

The various bills carrying appropriations for the military establishment are prepared by different subcommittees of these two great committees of the House, consisting of different members. There is no unity of action; there can be none. There is no economy of expenditure, but, on the contrary, unnecessary extravagance due to looseness of methods. Under the present rule of distributing appropriations the House is unable to judge how much our military establishment costs us, and the people of this country, for the most part unfamiliar with the details of our procedure, must necessarily be absolutely in the dark as to how much they are paying. There is, moreover, a custom, which is natural but none the less reprehensible, of always appropriating a little less than will probably be needed, trusting to luck or deficiency bills to make good the shortage. A member in charge of an appropriation bill may therefore be able to make an excellent showing for economy on the floor of this House and yet before the fiscal year is over an apparent economy may prove to be wasteful extravagance. The same methods of distributing appropriations intended for the same general purpose exists to a lesser degree in reference to all the great Departments of the Government. Thus a very substantial sum, running up into the millions, destined for the support of the Navy, is always carried on the deficiency bills.

Since I have been a member of this House, my friend the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] has made repeated and earnest efforts to have the rules changed so as to give his committee jurisdiction over all appropriations for the support of the military establishment, but thus far his efforts have met with absolutely no success. The present system is extravagant and wasteful; it is unfair to the Committee on Military Affairs, which is held responsible by the country; it is unfair to the members of this House; it is unfair to the people of the United States.

During the early days of the present session I listened with the greatest interest to a most able speech delivered on this floor by my friend the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCALL]. During the course of his remarks he made what was to me the astounding prediction that before this year was out the total war budget would amount to \$300,000,000. I have made a very careful examination of all the appropriation bills that have been reported to this House during the present session, and also of all the communications received from the Secretary of the Treasury, and I find that the prediction of the gentleman from Massachusetts has been fulfilled. Although we are supposed to be at peace, the war budget will even exceed three hundred millions.

I do not claim that my figures are absolutely accurate, for there may be items that I have overlooked; but I am sure that if there is any inaccuracy it is rather that my figures are too low than too high. I have taken the appropriations as contained in the bills reported to the House. It is a well-known fact that the other branch of Congress never reduces an appropriation. It is a conservative estimate that the appropriations are increased, on an average, about 8 per cent in the Senate, and finally leave conference and are enacted with a net increase of about 5 per cent over the original figures of the House. It must be remembered that my figures do not include the additional compensation paid to United States officers occupying quasi civil positions in Cuba or in the Philippines, nor do they include the cost of the local police

in Cuba. Both of these expenditures are paid out of the insular revenues. There is no possible way of discovering their amount, but it is safe to assume that it is very large. Nor do my figures include the appropriations for the enlargement of the insane asylum at Anacostia, chiefly necessitated by the great increase in the number of insane soldiers returned from the Philippines.

In all other civilized countries the war budget includes expenditures resulting from past wars. Thus the war budget of Germany carries the pension list and other appropriations arising from the Austrian and French wars, while the French budget carries all appropriations arising out of the German war. We fail to take into consideration any of the expenditures arising from the Mexican, civil, or Spanish wars in estimating the cost of our military establishment. In the figures I have prepared I have entirely ignored the interest on the bonded debt created by past wars, and I have, moreover, omitted all items that could possibly be questioned, such as appropriations for the purchase and care of parks commemorating battles. So as to reach a conclusion on the cost of the entire war budget, I have included the appropriations for the Navy. Under the appropriations for the Navy I have omitted the Hydrographic Office, the Naval Observatory, and the Naval Almanac Office. It may be said that it is unfair to include deficiencies for the past year, but as there always are deficiency appropriations, and as it is conceded there will be deficiency appropriations at the beginning of the next session, and as the deficiencies thus far recommended are some \$20,000,000 less than those of the past year, I have taken them into account, for otherwise it would be impossible to reach a conclusion as to the probable total amount carried on House bills during this session for the maintenance of the military establishment.

It must be further remembered, and this is a most important consideration, which is seldom thought of by Americans, that the continental war budgets include without an exception the cost of maintaining in time of peace the cadres of the war army, and this is a very large expense, for not only must the material for armies ranging from three to four million men be kept constantly on hand and in perfect order, but there is a further necessity of keeping upon the pay rolls a large number of officials who deal entirely with the reserves and who do not appear upon the strength of the peace army. Furthermore, there is scarcely a continental country that does not maintain strategic railways out of the war budget; besides, at the great maneuvers it is the invariable custom to mobilize in whole or in part the first line of reserves.

In tabulating the cost of foreign navies it has been impossible to show more than the total cost and the cost per capita of population, for the relative efficiency of naval establishments does not depend so much upon the number of men as upon the relative excellence of the vessels constituting the Navy.

For purposes of comparison, I have taken the armies and navies of Austria-Hungary, France, the German Empire, Italy, and Russia. I have not included Great Britain, for its conditions have been abnormal for nearly two years. I have based my estimates on the enlisted strength of the armies referred to, excluding commissioned officers. The figures are the most recent obtainable without direct communication with foreign authorities and are for the most part for the last fiscal year of the several countries, although in some cases they are for 1898-99. The German naval budget does not include the extraordinary expenditures for the new navy authorized by the recent enactment of the Reichstag. This does not begin to be effective until the next fiscal year. In estimating the equivalent in dollars of the Italian budget I have allowed 6 per cent for the depreciation of the present paper currency—a very moderate estimate. The Russian budget will appear abnormally low, for I have recently seen it stated at \$159,000,000. This is because the ruble has been assumed to be the gold ruble, worth 52 cents, but the budget is expressed in paper rubles, and is now, under a recent order of M. Witte, uniformly reckoned at two-thirds of the gold ruble. I have therefore called it 34.6 cents.

The bill before us (Army appropriation bill) carries \$117,994,649.10; the Military Academy bill carried \$700,151.88, and the fortifications bill carried \$7,227,461. The legislative, executive, and judicial bill carried \$1,227,266, all chargeable to the support of the Army, including the support of the office of the Secretary of War, the office of the Auditor for the War Department, the offices of the heads of the so-called "staff" departments, maintenance of the Department building, rent, stationery, postage, and contingent expenses. The sundry civil bill as reported to the House carries \$1,721,110 directly chargeable to the support of the Army, including expenditures for arsenals, armories, and military posts, bringing home "the remains of those who died abroad." But, besides all this, the Secretary of the Treasury has sent to the House three letters recommending appropriations to meet deficiencies for the present fiscal year amounting to \$23,197,462.86. Accordingly, we find that the House has during the present session appropriated, or is about to appropriate, for the support of what may be called the active Army, \$152,068,100.84.

The appropriations growing out of past wars amount to a total of \$154,694,292. I have charged to this account every item that could by any possible construction be assumed to refer to past wars, and not to the maintenance of the present Army. The pension appropriation bill carried \$145,245,230. The cost of administering the Pension Bureau will amount to \$3,352,790. The Record and Pension Office costs \$585,170. I have further included appropriations for National and State Homes, back pay, etc., cemeteries, and \$712,580 for extra clerks due to the Spanish war. Adding the appropriations due to past wars to the appropriation for the active Army, we find a total of \$303,762,392.84, which represents the total of our Army budget. Taking the total cost of our active Army, and assuming the enlisted strength of the Army to be 100,000, we find the cost per annum of each enlisted man to be \$1,520. Taking the total Army budget, including appropriations arising from past wars, we find the cost per annum of each enlisted man \$3,067.

Without including appropriations arising from past wars, we find the cost of the Army per capita of population to be \$1.99. Including appropriations arising from past wars, we find the cost of the Army per capita of population to be \$4.02. The army budget of Austria-Hungary is \$67,564,446, the cost of maintaining 1 enlisted man for one year being \$183.86, and the cost of the army per capita of population \$1.50. The army budget of France is \$128,959,064, the cost of maintaining 1 enlisted man is \$218.74, and the cost per capita of population is \$3.34. The army budget of the German Empire is \$156,127,743, the cost per annum of 1 enlisted man is \$277.85, the cost per capita of population is \$2.93. The army budget of Italy is \$43,920,132, the cost of maintaining 1 enlisted man per annum is \$202.65, the cost per capita of population is \$1.39. The army budget of Russia is \$99,927,997, the cost of maintaining 1 enlisted man is \$119.65, the cost per capita of population is 77 cents.

The appropriations for the support of the naval establishment are by no means so widely distributed as are those for the Army. The naval bill carries \$77,016,635.60. In the legislative, executive, and judicial bill there are carried appropriations directly chargeable to the support of the Navy, including pay of the clerical force in the Auditor's office, the office of the Secretary, the office of the heads of the bureaus, maintenance of building, and contingent expenses, amounting to \$399,150. In the sundry civil bill there are carried, for printing and binding, appropriations amounting to \$127,000. Up to the present time the Secretary of the Treasury has submitted to the House a statement of deficiencies for the support of the naval establishment amounting to \$2,491,549.64, making a total of \$80,034,335.24 that the House has appropriated or is about to appropriate during the present session for the support of the naval establishment. In addition to this the legislative, executive, and judicial bill carries an appropriation of \$21,800 for the payment of extra clerks whose employment is necessitated by the Spanish war, making a total naval budget of \$80,056,135.24.

The naval budget of Austria-Hungary is \$7,028,167, a cost per capita of population of 15 cents. The naval budget of France is \$61,238,478, a cost per capita of population of \$1.58. The naval budget of the German Empire is \$32,419,602, a cost per capita of population of 62 cents. The naval budget of Italy is \$18,455,111, a cost per capita of population of 58 cents. The naval budget of Russia is \$48,132,220, a cost per capita of population of 37 cents.

The combined appropriations for the Army and Navy represent the total war budget, or, as some European countries prefer to call it, the "defense budget." The total war budget of the United States, excluding appropriations due to past wars, amounts to \$233,102,435, or a cost per capita of population of \$3.03. Our total war budget, including appropriations due to past wars, amounts to \$386,818,528, a cost per capita of population of \$5.06. The total war budget of Austria-Hungary is \$74,592,613, a cost per capita of population of \$1.66. The total war budget of France is \$190,197,542, a cost per capita of population of \$4.92. The total war budget of the German Empire is \$188,547,345, a cost per capita of population of \$3.60. The total war budget of Italy is \$62,375,243, a cost per capita of population of \$1.97. The total war budget of Russia is \$148,000,017, a cost per capita of population of \$1.14. The combined total war budgets of France and of the German Empire amount to \$378,744,887, or \$8,073,640 less than that of the United States.

The criticism has been made that there can be no comparison between the cost of maintaining our Army and the cost of maintaining those of Europe, for the reason that the European private receives "no pay" and ours receives \$156 a year. As a matter of fact, while service is compulsory on the Continent, the continental private is paid a small sum, amounting on the average to about \$56 a year. In other words, our private receives about \$100 more than his comrade of Europe. This criticism does not affect comparisons, as will be seen on the consideration of a few figures. The war budget of the German Empire is the largest in Europe. Were the Prussian private to receive the same pay as our private the Prussian army budget would be swelled to \$212,354,343. Were

the Russian private to receive the same pay as our private the Russian budget would be swelled to about \$190,000,000 per annum. The difference in pay does not account for the proportionate difference in the size of the budgets, for were our Army to be increased to the size of that of the German Empire our budget would be increased by \$702,644,320, making a total of \$854,712,420, without including expenses due to past wars, or, including such expenses, making an Army budget of \$1,009,406,712. Were our Army to be increased to the size of Russia's, our budget would be increased by \$1,132,120,320, making a total Army budget, without including appropriations due to past wars, of \$1,284,188,320, or, including appropriations due to past wars, making a total budget of \$1,438,882,612.

I submit these figures to the consideration of the House without any comment whatsoever. Comment is unnecessary.

TABLE A.—Analysis of the war budget of the United States as agreed to, or about to be agreed to, by the House of Representatives, first session Fifty-sixth Congress.

1. ARMY.	
Appropriations for the active Army.	
Army bill.....	\$117,994,649.10
Military Academy bill.....	700,151.88
Fortification bill.....	7,227,461.00
Legislative, executive, and judicial bill:	
Office of the Secretary of War.....	\$104,150
Office of the Auditor for the War Department.....	318,300
Offices of heads of so-called "staff" departments.....	653,826
Maintenance of three-eighths of Department building.....	45,990
Rent.....	13,500
Stationery.....	32,500
Postage.....	1,000
Contingent expenses.....	58,000
	1,227,268.00
Sundry civil bill:	
Arsenals and armories.....	281,550
Military posts.....	1,008,960
Bringing home dead.....	150,000
Maps, etc.....	5,100
Printing and binding.....	244,000
Repairs, three-eighths Department building.....	31,500
	1,721,110.00
Deficiencies submitted:	
December 11, 1900.....	12,062,223.36
January 21, 1901.....	5,835,239.50
January 26, 1901.....	5,300,000.00
	23,197,462.86
Total, active Army.....	152,068,100.84
Appropriations growing out of past wars.	
Pensions.....	\$145,245,230.00
Salaries, Pension Bureau, etc.....	3,352,790.00
Record and Pension Office.....	585,170.00
National Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.....	3,074,142.00
State Homes for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers.....	950,000.00
Back pay and bounty (civil war).....	325,000.00
Arrears of pay (Spanish war).....	200,000.00
National cemeteries.....	191,880.00
Artificial limbs and appliances.....	27,000.00
Headstones and burials.....	28,000.00
Apache prisoners.....	2,500.00
Secretary of War, extra clerks (Spanish war).....	600,000.00
Auditor for War Department, extra clerks (Spanish war).....	112,580.00
	154,694,292.00
Total, active Army.....	152,068,100.84
Total Army budget.....	306,762,392.84
2. NAVY.	
Naval bill.....	\$77,016,635.60
Legislative, executive, and judicial bill:	
Office of the Secretary of the Navy.....	\$47,900.00
Office of the Auditor for the Navy Department.....	68,080.00
Offices of heads of bureaus, etc.....	224,430.00
Maintenance of three-eighths of Department building.....	45,990.00
Contingent expenses.....	12,750.00
	399,150.00
Sundry civil bill:	
Printing and binding.....	127,000.00
Deficiencies submitted:	
December 11, 1900.....	74,481.09
December 17, 1900.....	20,000.00
January 21, 1901.....	2,267,068.55
January 25, 1901.....	130,000.00
	2,491,549.64
Total, active Navy.....	80,034,335.24
Auditor for Navy Department, extra clerks (Spanish war).....	21,800.00
Total Navy budget.....	80,056,135.24
3. RECAPITULATION.	
Active Army.....	152,068,100.84
Active Navy.....	80,034,335.24
	\$232,102,436.08
Army (past wars).....	154,694,292.00
Navy (past wars).....	21,800.00
	154,716,092.00
Total war budget.....	386,818,528.08

TABLE B.—Analysis of war budgets of various armies.

	Population by last census.	Latest obtainable army budget.	Total enlisted strength, peace footing.	Cost of maintaining one enlisted man for one year.	Cost of army per capita of population.	Latest obtainable naval budget.	Cost of navy per capita of population.	Total war budget.	Cost of army and navy combined per capita of population.
Austria-Hungary.....	44,901,036	\$67,564,446	368,002	\$183.86	\$1.50	\$7,023,167	\$0.15	\$74,592,613	\$1.66
France.....	38,517,975	128,950,064	589,541	218.74	3.34	61,238,478	1.58	190,197,542	4.92
German Empire.....	52,246,589	156,127,743	563,268	277.85	1.98	32,419,602	.62	188,547,345	3.60
Italy.....	31,479,217	43,920,132	216,720	202.65	1.39	18,455,111	.58	62,375,243	1.97
Russia.....	129,211,113	99,927,797	835,143	119.65	.77	48,132,230	.37	148,060,017	1.14
United States, not including cost of past wars.....	76,295,220	152,068,100	100,000	1,520.00	1.99	80,034,335	1.04	233,102,435	3.03
United States, including cost of past wars.....	76,295,220	306,762,392	100,000	3,067.00	4.02	80,056,135	1.04	386,818,527	5.06

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of the time on this side.

Mr. SULZER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GAINES].

Mr. GAINES. Mr. Chairman, I listened with a great deal of attention to what has been said this morning by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN], together with the remarks of those who have replied to him. They discussed the fruits of what is very well called militarism or the findings and judgments of the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, the President, who controls absolutely during war the operations of our Army. These harsh military rulings make all the more pertinent what I shall read. I had in my hand and was intending to read, as a part of my remarks, that which I now send to the desk to be read in my time, the opinion of a distinguished citizen and an eminent lawyer, one of the most eminent jurists, I think, that this country has ever produced, Judge David J. Brewer, of Kansas.

The Clerk read as follows:

WOULD KILL MONROE DOCTRINE—JUSTICE BREWER IS OPPOSED TO IMPERIALISM AND FOREIGN ALLIANCE.

When Justice Brewer was in Leavenworth, a few days ago, he gave the Times, in a short interview, his views upon the proposed annexation by this country of conquered Spanish territory.

He then expressed himself as opposed to territorial aggrandizement, and since he made his ideas public he has given the question considerable thought, and now gives his reasons for the position he takes in declaring against the annexation of the Philippines, Porto Rico, and Cuba, and against territorial expansion or an Anglo-American alliance:

"I think we may have to take possession of Cuba, Porto Rico, and the Philippines as a war measure and for the purpose of getting indemnity. I should look upon all save Cuba simply in the same light as if I had a mortgage upon a man's farm. I would foreclose that mortgage, not because I wanted to take the farm, but for the reason I wanted the farm to sell in order to raise the money. I do not see how Spain will ever be able to pay us an indemnity, and so I would take her real estate. I think it is consistent with our policy, and it is certainly necessary that we should keep Cuba for a while and have an army there to maintain good order. There are more than a million people on the island, and it will take some time to get a stable government, and until they do, I think, as a matter of humanity, that we should keep a force of troops there to preserve order. When we have demanded possession of those islands as security for the payment of indemnity, and have kept Cuba for the sake of order, I think we should then let them go.

"In the territory we have hitherto taken into our Government we have introduced a Territorial legislature, or a government of the people. I do not think that that can be done with those people, and I think it will be introducing a new system of government into this country. Again, I think it would compel an unnecessary increase in our Army. I do not know but that some increase is needed. We would be bound to have a large increase in our Navy, and I do not like the idea of this country considering itself a military power. I think if we had a large Army and a large Navy we would be getting into trouble with other nations. It is human nature for an Army officer and a Navy officer to want promotion, and if it does not come rapidly enough he wants a war to bring it about.

"In so far as the Philippines are concerned especially, it seems to me that it would be a black eye to the Monroe doctrine. When we said that the European nations must not take possession of any territory in this continent it was a sort of implied declaration that we would not take any possessions in their continent. If we would reach out into Asiatic countries and take the islands there, it would look as though we could not say anything if European nations reach over here and take possession of territory.

"If it had been proposed in Congress the 1st of January to appropriate the Philippine Islands, Porto Rico, and Cuba, I believe it would have been voted down 4 to 1. Yet the war has developed such conditions that a great many men in Congress as well as out of it are beginning to think that colonial expansion is before us. There is a very different sentiment in Congress than there was at that time."

"What is your idea about the proposed Anglo-Saxon alliance, as mentioned by Chamberlain in his speech some time ago and talked of in this country?" was asked.

"I do not believe in a formal alliance. I think George Washington's advice is as sound to-day as when it was given—to avoid all alliances."—*Leavenworth Times*, August, 1898.

[Here the hammer fell.]

Mr. SULZER. I yield to the gentleman from Tennessee sufficient time to conclude the reading of the document which he holds in his hand.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. I desire to ask the gentleman from Tennessee the date of what has been read.

Mr. GAINES. That is just what I was going to state. This was printed in the Leavenworth Times in August, 1898, when Judge Brewer was there.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Has the gentleman had this read for the purpose of approving it or for the purpose of criticising it?

Mr. GAINES. I want to say that Judge Brewer's utterances on anti-colonialism and anti-imperialism I do approve. I regard Judge Brewer as being a gentleman of unimpeachable character and a great jurist.

Mr. CALDERHEAD. Mr. Chairman, I have not asked concerning that. I know Judge Brewer's character and opinion. What I ask is what the gentleman intends to do, whether to approve or criticise what he has just had read.

Mr. GAINES. If you will just wait a moment I will assure you that I will, with a great deal of pleasure, indorse what he has said here particularly. First, he says, it will kill the Monroe doctrine. That needs no comment.

I think it would compel an unnecessary increase in our Army. I do not know but that some increase is needed.

That is, in our Army.

In the territory we have hitherto taken into our Government we have introduced a Territorial legislature or a government of the people.

A government of the people, not a government by the military, Mr. Chairman.

I do not think that can be done with these people, and I think it will be introducing a new system of government into this country.

Now, does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CALDERHEAD] indorse that? Again:

I think it would compel an unnecessary increase in our Army.

Mr. Chairman, the present law creates an army of 100,000, and although it is in the power of Congress to raise and enlarge or diminish the Army, the bill is so framed that the President himself enlarges or diminishes it just as he chooses. The President does the raising, not Congress, under this law.

We would be bound to have a large increase in our Navy, and I do not like the idea of this country considering itself a military power.

I indorse that. Does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CALDERHEAD] indorse that?

I think if we had a large army and a large navy we would be getting into trouble with other nations.

Mr. Chairman, I have never known even a schoolboy who carried a chip around on his shoulder who did not regularly get into a fight. As I heard an old darky once say—and they say very wise things sometimes—"You keep on spreading out your feet and somebody will step on them sure."

It is human nature for an Army officer and a Navy officer to want promotion.

Now, that is all right, Mr. Chairman. But listen to this:

And if it does not come rapidly enough, he wants a war to bring it about.

That is all wrong, and Judge Brewer says so. We see this is true by proof of it here every day.

In so far as the Philippines are concerned especially, it seems to me that it would be a black eye to the Monroe doctrine.

That is all wrong.

When we said that the European nations must not take possession of any territory on this continent, it was a sort of implied declaration that we would not take any possessions in their continent.

When we said to them, "We do not propose to have you come over here and establish monarchies and empires upon the American continent," by necessary implication, as this great jurist says, we said to them, "We will not come on your side; you stay on your side." That is the common-sense meaning of this doctrine. It is one of self-defense.

If we were to reach out into the Asiatic countries and take the islands there, it would look as though we could not say anything if European nations reach over here and take possession of territory.

Thus you see, Mr. Chairman, from one of the purest sources from which I think we can get information at this day and time, we were warned as by a voice of prophecy, as early as 1898, to cling to and perpetuate our Republic.

Mr. SULZER. I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. NORTON].

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I listened with some degree of regret to the discussion upon the question of army desertion by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SLAYDEN] and also by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GARDNER]. No man who knows the gentleman from Texas could believe or would believe that he would make a deliberate misstatement or utter an untruth upon this floor, and I do not think anyone ever questioned the patriotism of the gentleman from Michigan. That patriotism, however, seemed a little bit supersensitive when he reached out so far as to say that his section of the State alone saved the flag during the war of 1861.

But there were things said in this debate that need careful consideration, and the statement of the gentleman from Texas ought not to go into the RECORD without a carefully considered reply.

Mr. Chairman, not all the men who are marked as deserters are justly so marked. I know of a regiment that ought to be marked as deserters, for they deserted their picket lines without giving notice and every man upon that picket line was left alone. The regiment went into the Confederacy in confinement, and these men on the picket line were left in the North, and they bore the record of desertion upon the muster-out roll.

The Committee on Military Affairs has not had enough time. Last winter, you know, they did not consider a single case of all the thousands laid before you. Not one came under your eyes. You had the great matter of Cœur d'Alene before you. My opinion is that these matters should be honestly investigated, and I do not believe that the Military Committee, which is so absorbed in building up a great Army and in providing the means for promotion of gentlemen and providing means for carrying on a war, is the proper committee to discuss these matters and to consider them. The Cœur d'Alene matter—what of it? It amounted to nothing. There never was even a report; and yet these men are carried along on the rolls and marked deserters year after year.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. Yes.

Mr. HULL. What did the gentleman say there was not a report upon?

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. The Cœur d'Alene matter.

Mr. HULL. Oh, yes; there was a full report.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. Published?

Mr. HULL. Published, and I can give you a copy of it.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. I should be mighty glad to have one. I have been trying to smoke it out. I have not seen one.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I trust the gentleman will yield to me a moment. I will extend his time.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. Certainly.

Mr. SULZER. In regard to this Cœur d'Alene matter I want to say here that, although the House printed the report of the majority and the report of the minority of the Military Affairs Committee, the committee and this House refused to print and publish the testimony, so that the people of this country could read about American imperialism in the Cœur d'Alene district. There was a resolution—

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. I hope this is not out of my time.

Mr. HULL. I will yield enough time to make up.

Mr. SULZER. So will I. There was a resolution adopted by the committee that there should be printed for each member of the committee three copies of the testimony taken in the Cœur d'Alene investigation regarding the outrages out there. That has never been complied with, and I am very glad that my distinguished friend the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. NORTON] has mentioned this matter, because I want to say it is a disgrace to Congress, a disgrace to the Republican party, that after an investigation which proved conclusively that the President of the United States had used the military power of this Government to crush laboring men struggling for their rights, and the military officers infringed the rights of citizens, that after that was all proved the Republican party in this House did not dare to publish the testimony so that the people of the country could read it and judge for themselves. The military authorities did things out there and brought about a condition of affairs in Idaho during the Cœur d'Alene labor troubles that no potentate, no emperor, and no czar in all the world would dare to do without being impeached or losing his head.

Mr. HULL. Will the gentleman yield a minute?

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. I should hate to lose the last two minutes I have.

Mr. SULZER. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio five minutes more.

Mr. HULL. And I will yield five minutes more. The gentleman shall not be hampered for time. Now, again I ask the gentleman to yield just a minute to state now this matter.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. Certainly.

Mr. HULL. I know my friend from Ohio always wants to be fair.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. I try to be.

Mr. HULL. Of course, he is, unfortunately, a Democrat. He can not help that.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. I am very proud of that.

Mr. SULZER. Well, it is too bad the gentleman from Iowa is a Republican.

Mr. HULL. I do not yield now. I have the floor by the courtesy of the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. SULZER. You have mine.

Mr. HULL. In the matter of the Cœur d'Alene, the gentleman from New York is the senior Democratic member of the committee. When the question of a report came before that committee, the committee had done all that the rules of the House permitted it to do. It had printed the evidence for the use of the committee, and the gentleman from New York and every other member of the committee had a full copy of it, and extra copies of it were given to those in interest. And, Mr. Chairman, when the question of making the report came, the majority of the committee quoted copiously from that evidence; and if the gentleman from New York had had the industry and had paid enough attention to the proceedings of the committee to make an intelligent report the minority of the committee would have quoted copiously on the evidence. They made no quotations, and when we made our report of our evidence our jurisdiction was concluded and it passed out of our hands.

I thank the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I regret exceedingly myself that every time something is to be done in the interest of my old comrades politics on one or the other side of this Chamber shall be injected into the matter. The idea I had in talking of the Cœur d'Alene matter was simply to say that the whole investigation did the country no good, and that the committee could have employed its time far better by attempting to make some regulation or establishing some rule or law whereby there would be no further necessity for presenting in this House such bills as those that come up about desertion. Mr. Chairman, it is untrue that every man who stands on the roll marked as a deserter was in truth a deserter. Thousands and thousands of men stand on the rolls with the stigma of desertion against their names by a rule of the Department—not the law alone, but a rule. The same rule that inveighs against the soldier in the Pension Bureau inveighs against him in the War Department by a construction of the law not intended by the law.

Now, Mr. Chairman, not that I want to inject any politics, for not a word of that will fall from my lips upon this question, but to give in the RECORD an answer to the statement of the gentleman from Texas, and because it is impossible within five minutes to make an answer properly, considerably, and consistently, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SULZER. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. GILBERT. Mr. Chairman, I avail myself of this opportunity of submitting to the House some remarks upon a question of very general interest to the whole country and to my constituents in particular. The English subsidy system, and indeed all of the so-called subsidy systems of other countries, are really not subsidies at all. They are merely contracts or subventions made by the government with certain ship companies for carrying the mails and for other services stipulated in the contract. They are often required to improve harbors, carry troops, build hotels, furnish laborers for the development of a particular industry, etc. They are usually required to make a certain speed in the delivery of mails, and not to stop for freight, and they are required to make stated trips whether loaded or not, etc.

These foreign contracts are usually let to the lowest and best bidder, and foreigners as well as citizens are permitted to bid at these public lettings and carry out the contract whether the ship was built at home or abroad. Take, for example, the contract between the English Government and the Jamaica Fruit and Produce Association, to begin May, 1900. (See Report of Commissioner of Navigation, 1899, p. 147.)

This so-called subsidy required the shipowner to make fortnightly trips at an average speed of 15 knots an hour, and to reserve storage room for at least 20,000 bunches of bananas. They were required to employ at least six agents in Jamaica to develop the fruit industry.

And they were also required to improve the wharf at Kingston and other ports, and to build one or more hotels on the island and, above all, to carry the British mails free of charge. For these services the British Government agreed to pay £10,000 per annum for a period of five years. This, you see, is not a subsidy at all. It is a contract for public services, for which the Government agrees to pay a reasonable compensation.

So with what are called German subsidies. The German Government, for example, empowered the imperial chancellor to pay 1,500,000 marks annually to the contractor, a steamship company,

for furnishing a regular fortnightly mail service with eastern Asia and Australia. The contractor guaranteed that the ships would make a certain speed, and it was expressly announced that it was owing to the peculiar circumstances and unusual expenses incident to the performance of this contract that governmental aid was bestowed.

It was then distinctly declared by the German Government—

That this need for the long voyage to eastern Asia and Australia could be met (not as in the case of relatively short voyages, as to America) by German shipping without Government assistance, but that such navigation, on account of its expense, should be promoted by State aid. (Report of Commissioner of Navigation for 1890, p. 148.)

England and Germany, even with their peculiar circumstances and laboring under a supposed necessity of maintaining large standing armies and fleets, would not think of supporting such a measure as is presented to this House.

This bill has none of the features of those so-called foreign subsidies. It does not require the ships to make any particular speed, except for the few hours during the test, and after that the ship may make any speed the owners may desire. There is nothing in this bill permitting the letting of contracts for carrying the mails to the lowest and best bidders; nothing that requires any certain number of trips to be made, nor any amount of freight to be carried.

It is nothing but a bold, bald application for a donation of the public money to assist some private gentlemen and corporations in their private business.

England has virtually monopolized the ocean-carrying trade, and yet not 3 per cent of her ships engaged in that business receive any assistance or subsidy from the Government, either by mail contracts or otherwise.

The Republican party has driven our ships from the ocean by retaining upon the statute books an antiquated navigation law, which prohibits an American citizen from having any vessel registered under the American flag for the foreign trade unless the ship has been built here at home.

Advocates of this bill say that steamships can be built 30 per cent cheaper in England than they can be built here. I do not believe one word of it. But if it is true, then let American citizens go there and buy ships, put them under the American flag, and our flag will be seen at every port and the sails of our merchantmen will whiten every sea.

Many American young ladies feel complimented to buy ragged, wax-headed foreign counts. They buy their finest dresses in Paris, so as to look attractive to ze count. The Navy purchases torpedoes in Austria and big cannon from Krupp, in Germany, and why not buy ships in England, if we can buy them cheaper and better there? Is there "a divinity that doth hedge about" a ship?

Trust magnates and promoters of monopoly in this country fill their mines and factories with the cheapest pauper labor they can find, and are then constantly heard appealing to the flag to divert the public attention away from their real schemes, and have the impudence to accuse the opponents of this measure of a want of patriotism unless they consent to stand by and be robbed without a murmur. My patriotism does not lead in that direction, and I am willing to buy anything, from a blanket to a ship, wherever they can be had for the least money.

The truth is that the Republican party, by retaining obsolete navigation laws and by its crazy notions of high protection, has almost destroyed our merchant marine. Every opportunity they get they put up the tariff higher and higher until millions of tons of imports are entirely excluded from our shores, and from which, of course, the Government derives no revenue. The only purpose accomplished by their high protective tariff is, as to many articles, to drive away the foreign competition, cripple the ocean carrying trade, and force the American citizen to pay double prices to the home manufacturer for these protected articles. Thus by retaining absurd navigation laws and absurd protective duties our merchant marine has dwindled until it is now almost "in articulo mortis."

Years ago the American clipper competed successfully with the ships of every country. During all of those years, down to 1861, most of our exports and imports were carried in American ships and we had outstripped the mother country in the ocean carrying trade. During those very years England was, as she is now, paying large sums for postal services and the United States was not paying a dollar. Subsidies did not bring England to the front then and subsidies will not restore our carrying trade now.

England then had the same absurd navigation laws that we have now. Ever since the reign of Richard II England remained under a law which required all of her merchandise, foreign and coastwise, to be carried in British ships, prohibited her people from buying foreign ships, and confined the commerce of her colonies to trading with the mother country.

These absurd statutes continued substantially unchanged at the time we achieved our independence. After the Revolution we copied these English laws, and, strange to say, they have never been repealed.

An American citizen can not go now where he pleases and buy a ship where he can buy it the cheapest, or, if he does, he is not allowed the protection of an American citizen and is not allowed to float the American flag from the masthead.

I say this is an antiquated and absurd statute. England discovered it to be so and repealed it in January, 1850. She then discovered that America was building wooden ships cheaper and better than she could build them. She then repealed the statute and said to her people: "Go to America, or anywhere else you please, and buy ships where you can buy them the cheapest; hoist from the masthead the Union Jack and engage in the ocean carrying trade if you like."

So long as these wooden ships maintained their supremacy upon the ocean the United States continued to carry in her own ships most of her exports and imports.

But the time came when these wooden ships could not compete with the new iron and steel vessels. England had a new process of making iron and steel which we did not possess, and she began to make ships cheaper than we could make them. We foolishly still kept our old laws on the books. We could not make the iron and steel ships ourselves. We would not allow American citizens to go there and buy them, or, if they did, they had to hoist the British flag. We still kept up our high tariff, forcing our ships to often come home empty because they could not pay the tariff duties. And now, having, after years of persistent tomfoolery, at last succeeded in driving our merchant ships from the ocean, it is proposed to take \$9,000,000 per year out of the public Treasury for the next twenty years, or \$180,000,000 in all, and pay it to certain shipowners who are already engaged in the ocean carrying trade and get them, by that means, to rebuild our foreign trade.

It is not proposed by this bill to help the farmer in any way to increase his crops or to encourage him to raise more horses, or cattle, or tobacco, or other farm products to be shipped abroad.

It is not proposed by this bill to cheapen the transportation of any of the products of the farm or factory to the seashore.

Indeed, it is not even proposed to lessen the freight rates on any commodities to be carried across the seas. The cost of exporting and importing is not to be lessened at all. There is really no complaint that ocean freights are too high. The complaint is that our exports and imports are carried under foreign flags, and we are to pay \$180,000,000 in order to change the flag.

The purpose of this bill is merely to assist certain shipowners, not to carry freights cheaper, but to pay them a donation of \$9,000,000 a year to enable them to carry our freights as cheap as they are being already carried in foreign ships.

Mr. Chamberlain, the Commissioner of Navigation, is now one of the staunch supporters of this subsidy scheme, and he has for two years devoted most of his annual reports to an argument trying to prove that this bill, or one similar to it, ought to pass. In his report for 1900 (p. 35) he thus confesses and gives away the entire project:

The scheme, in effect, proposes to equalize the difference between the cost of building vessels in the United States and in Great Britain and between the costs of navigating vessels under the American and under foreign flags.

It also proposes to offset the subsidies or mail compensation which certain types of vessels receive from foreign governments.

Of course, if we hire steamships to carry the mails we should pay them a reasonable compensation, just as we pay railroads and steamboats and other carriers for similar services.

So that the two chief reasons remaining, or rather the chief excuses, for this bill are:

First. The claim that ships can be built from 20 to 30 per cent cheaper in England than they can in this country, and we want to force those who buy ships to buy them in this country and donate to the purchaser out of the public Treasury that 20 or 30 per cent difference.

Second. The claim is that the wages paid employees on American ships are higher than are paid employees of foreign ships, and this subsidy is excused as a donation to the American shipowners for the difference in wages he is required to pay.

Now, let us look at these two propositions for a moment. It is certainly not true now, whatever may have been true formerly, that either iron or steel ships can be built any cheaper on the Clyde or Mersey or elsewhere than they can be built in our own shipyards. We have more coal in the State of Kentucky alone than there is in all the British Isles.

We have more suitable timber convenient to our own shipyards than they have in England. Indeed, England imports most of her ship timber from our Southern States. We have the most skilled workmen, the most ingenious mechanics, we have more wealth and more enterprise than any other country in the world. We are to-day manufacturing and selling abroad every conceivable article of machine and factory, and selling them by the hundreds of thousands, and selling them in competition with all the world. Shiploads of sewing machines, farm machinery, bridges, saw-mills, trolley cars, electric and other machinery, locomotives, and steam cars, and every other kind of machinery and invention are going every day across the seas. Foreigners are buying them

because they are cheaper and better than similar articles manufactured in other countries.

Now, is not it a little strange that a steamship is the only thing that American citizens have not the skill nor the enterprise to build and man as cheap and as good as these things can be done by foreigners?

It is not true, and those who come here with this bill asking alms in behalf of shipowners are offering an insult to the shipbuilders of this country.

Just the other day I read from the Louisville Times this article:

GLASGOW, December 20, 1900.

Clyde shipbuilders recently placed orders for 150,000 tons of plates in the United States, at a saving of £50,000. The depression in Scotch steel and malleable iron trades is acute. Fourteen furnaces will be damped at the end of the year. The steel works are talking of closing indefinitely.

The truth is, and everybody knows it, that the manufactures of iron and steel in this country have, in the last five years, completely outstripped similar industries in every other country; and everybody knows that these are the articles of chief expense in the construction of modern steamships.

In the Philadelphia Inquirer of December 10, 1900, I find this article:

LONDON, December 10, 1900.

The Daily Mail has received the following by mail from its Calcutta correspondent:

"The port commissioners recently invited tenders for locomotives. The lowest English tender quoted £1,544 for each locomotive and wanted nine months to complete the order. The lowest American tender quoted £1,260 and asked for six months. The latter was accepted, subject to the approval of the Government."

We see, therefore, that Americans offer to build locomotives for \$1,385.92 cheaper for each locomotive, and besides, ship them across to Calcutta and drive the English locomotive builders out of the market on their own grounds, and yet we can not build a steamship here at home as cheap as they do in England.

The proposition is preposterous.

Mr. Carnegie is certainly good authority upon this subject. In an address delivered by him to the Lotus Club February 27, 1900, he said:

Reference has sometimes been made to me as to the share I have taken in the work of insuring for our country supremacy in steel, a supremacy which obviously carries with it a future supremacy in so many different departments of industry, for steel is the great foundation article on which so many other articles rest. The cheapest steel means, before long, the cheapest ships, as it to-day means the cheapest agricultural implements, bicycles, motor cars, wire, nails, and a thousand and one things of which steel is the chief part.

It goes without saying that we are to stop exporting steel in crude forms and more and more to export it in manufactured, finished articles, from needles to ships.

As the historian, Green, says: "The future home of the English-speaking race is to be found, not on the banks of the Tweed or the Thames, but on the banks of the Hudson and the Mississippi." So I predict that the future seat of shipbuilding is to be found, not on the shores of Great Britain, but upon our Atlantic seaboard.

Nearly ten years ago Mr. Cramp, the great American shipbuilder, published an article in the North American Review which ought to be carefully reread, at this time, by every advocate of the pending bill. (See North American Review, January, 1892.)

He there places before the reader this valuable information:

The proper form in which to put the question is, Can you build a ship to do the work of the *City of New York*, or the *Majestic*, or the *Columbia*, in all respects, for the same cost? To that question I would reply: Yes; or within as small a margin as would be likely to prevail in a similar case between any two British shipyards. It is a fact that first cost of ships is not only not a prime factor, but it is not even a serious factor in any competition that may occur between this country and Great Britain for a share of the traffic of the ocean.

American shipyards have built or are building about forty naval vessels of numerous rates and types, all of the very highest and most effective class in the world; and this development has been crowded into a space of about seven years.

The disparity in cost of naval vessels between our yards and those of Great Britain, ton for ton, gun for gun, and performance for performance, has dwindled in seven years until, in the case of the three latest battle ships, the margin between our prices and those of similar construction abroad may be expressed by a very small figure.

Now, mind you, this was said nearly ten years ago, and before our present splendid development in the manufacture of iron and steel, referred to by Mr. Carnegie.

Even Mr. Chamberlain, who labors so assiduously in his two last annual reports to sustain the cause of subsidies, produces figures that are convincing that no subsidies should be voted. Thus, on page 34 of his report for 1900, we find this language:

The United States thus possesses the capital and can manufacture cheaply material for shipbuilding on a great scale.

The skilled labor which the industry requires undoubtedly exists in abundance. Sixteen years ago the United States used the designs of foreign contractors in beginning its new navy. At the present time we have a large number of most competent naval officers and marine engineers, and our best technical schools are constantly adding to the number.

British and German shipyards are adopting labor-saving machinery, which American inventive genius has already applied to shipbuilding.

Every branch of steel manufacture in the United States of late years has grown so rapidly, and for that material so many new ones have recently developed that American steel workers in numbers and skill are unequaled by those of any other nation.

Finally, if there be such a thing as a national genius for the mastery of transportation problems, it is probably American.

Again, we find this same author, on page 35, making use of this language:

In the United States have at last been created the conditions: Abundance of capital, cheap materials, practical experience, constructive talent, and skilled labor, which, if brought together effectively by a demand, guarantees the country's future as a great shipbuilding and maritime commercial power.

Then, under these conditions, why donate the people's money to help along an industry whose present condition and future prospects are so brilliant and so promising?

Besides that, the underlying principles of this bill are wrong. Even if we can not build ships as cheap as they can build them in England, it is much better to go there and buy them than it is to vote a subsidy and pay those who are forced to buy at home the difference.

We raise fine horses and cattle for sale down in Kentucky, but the farmer there can not raise horses and cattle as cheap as they can upon the broad, grassy plains of Australia. He has to pay more for the land in the first place, more for labor, and has to buy provender and feed them at higher prices.

Now, why not ascertain the cost of raising a horse or steer in Kentucky and the cost of raising a horse or steer in Australia and pay a bounty to the Kentucky farmer to the amount of the difference out of the public Treasury? Will some advocate of this bill explain the difference in principle? If there is any difference, it is in favor of the farmer, because his surplus is shipped abroad and sold in the open markets of the world. And, besides, that surplus sold abroad is sold in competition with the pauper labor of every land; not only so, but the price paid for the surplus abroad fixes the prices in his home market, and, for my part, I would vote a bounty to the farmer for the articles he exports and sells in competition with the pauper labor of Europe and Asia before I would vote a subsidy to shipowners.

But they argue, in the second place, that American shipowners can not compete with foreigners in the ocean carrying trade because the American has to pay higher wages for sailors. Mind you, there is no law which requires an American shipowner to hire citizens of this country to operate his ships. He is at perfect liberty to go into any foreign port and hire sailors and operators of every kind wherever he can get them the cheapest, and the fact is that very few American citizens engage in this kind of service. They can get steadier, more comfortable, and better paying employment on land, and therefore a very large majority of employees engaged on American ships are negroes, Chinese, Scandinavians, and others not American citizens.

This bill offers no protection to wage-earners at all. It does not even require any of the sailors to be citizens of this country.

The nearest approach to any such provision is found in section 5, which provides:

That no vessel shall be entitled to compensation under section 1 of this act unless at least one-fourth of her crew shall be citizens of the United States or such persons as shall be within the provisions of section 2147 of the Revised Statutes of the United States. If it shall happen at any time that the foregoing stated proportion of an American crew can not be reasonably obtained, * * * the shipment of persons not within the preceding description shall be allowed.

Now, of course, the shipowner has merely to reduce wages instead of advancing them, and he will then be unable to hire American sailors at these reduced wages, and so the law will permit him to still pick up his crew in any foreign port, just as he is now permitted to do.

The legitimate effect of the bill is therefore to reduce wages instead of advancing them.

But what if the American shipowner does have to pay his American crew higher wages than the foreign shipowner? Does he not get more skill, more energy, and better results? Is that any reason why he should come to Congress and ask that the difference in wages be made up to him out of the public Treasury? Does not the American farmer, the American railroad builder, the American housebuilder, and every other American employer have to pay higher wages than are paid in the crowded and poverty-stricken centers of the Old World? Are these farmers and housebuilders and other employers of American labor here clamoring for bounties and asking the Government to make up their differences in wages over and above what they would have to pay if they had employed the rag tag from Europe and Asia? The mere presentation of such a claim as this to Congress illustrates the height of impudence to which the protected industries of this country have been brought. Let the American shipowner and other protected industries pay higher wages. Their whole protection theory is maintained upon the assumption that higher tariffs enable them to pay higher wages, and they can not have their cake and eat it, too.

So that when you boil down this contention, these subsidy sharks are here yelping in one breath that the high-tariff system must be preserved in order to keep up high wages, and high wages keep the American shipowner from competing with his rivals on the sea, and so these higher wages must be paid back to him out of the public Treasury.

The American sailors and crew have to be paid higher wages than the English and other foreign sailors get or starve, because, under our high protective tariff system, they are required to pay \$4 for a blanket that the Englishman can get for \$3.50 and they are required to pay \$5 for a pair of shoes that the Englishman can get for \$3.50, and so on through the list of articles necessary for the support of themselves and families.

No, indeed; 90 per cent of the employees on American ships are negroes, Chinese, and other foreigners, and this bill offers no protection or advantage whatever to American seamen.

The shipowner will pocket whatever subsidy is given by the Government, and he will still pick up his crew in any foreign port and wherever he can get them the cheapest.

The effect of this bill will be that the farmer and the manufacturer must still pay the same old freight rates for the same old services in transporting their commodities to the sea and then across the sea to the foreign markets, and they are then to be taxed \$180,000,000 in addition for the sentiment of having the American flag to wave from the masthead of the ship that carries the goods.

Such a flag, if understood in a foreign port, will bring neither credit nor honor to this country. On the contrary, every American flag thus flung to the breeze will be an emblem of oppression and an advertisement of an iniquitous tax, and, like the flag that floats from the palace of the Sultan of Sulu and those that float from the custom-houses of Porto Rico, will be neither beautiful nor attractive to any true American citizen. Such a flag will show to all the world that greed, monopoly, and privilege have so dominated the American Congress that our Government has taxed her own citizens an enormous sum to induce her own shipowners to do for the American people what any other ships of any other country were offering to do without the tax.

Nine-tenths of our exports are, in fact, farm products—flour, pork, wheat, cattle, tobacco, corn, cotton, etc.—and the problem is becoming more and more serious how to get this vast surplus to the foreign markets.

Everybody knows that the entire cost of transporting to market, both by rail and ship, is paid by the producer.

The first thing to be done by the purchasers and brokers who handle these commodities is to ascertain what will be the cost to carry them to the seashore by rail and thence to the foreign markets, and that cost, together with the insurance and a reasonable profit to the handler, are all deducted from the price that can be obtained in the foreign market, and the farmer gets only what is left. The farmer is therefore, above everybody else, interested in cheap railroad freights, cheap ship rates, and an open, active competition in transportation, both upon the land and the sea.

For this reason I am especially anxious to see the canal built at Nicaragua or somewhere else across the Isthmus. We will thus be three or four thousand miles nearer to China and Japan than the countries of Europe, and all of our great rivers leading into the Mississippi and Gulf of Mexico will become great highways of traffic that can not be monopolized. Extortionate freight rates can not be charged as are now effected by traffic associations and the pooling of freight rates by the railroad companies. With this nearness to the Eastern markets, European shipowners can not compete with us and our merchant marine will need no subsidies.

Whatever will lessen the cost of getting our products to their final destination will therefore help both the farmer and the manufacturer.

But this bill does not even promise any assistance to either. So that, if it be true that we can build ships as cheap in our own shipyards as they can be built in England—and I have shown reasons, I think, conclusive that they can be so built—then there is no excuse for this subsidy. If we can not build them as cheap, then repeal the navigation laws and allow our citizens to go there and buy them and give them American registry, and there is still no excuse for this subsidy.

Our commercial treaties with all the leading nations accord to all the ships of all these countries which are engaged in the foreign trade the same rights and privileges that are accorded to our own ships, and under the existing laws of this country, if it be true, as claimed, that England builds ships 30 per cent cheaper than we do, France, Germany, and other countries can go to England and buy ships for 30 per cent cheaper than we can build them, and can bring them into our ports and carry away our commodities and underbid our own ships, having this advantage at the start.

Then repeal the law and vote down the subsidy. I can not understand the wisdom of a law which drives our carrying trade into German and other foreign ships by forcing an American citizen to pay a million dollars for a ship that the German can buy for seven hundred thousand.

My proposition is to repeal the absurd navigation laws and let the American citizen go to England and buy his ships, if he can do so, for the \$700,000, just as the German does.

But the advocates of this subsidy say, No, force him to stay at home and pay a million dollars for this ship, and we will tax the

American farmer and manufacturer for \$300,000 and donate it to him.

The shipbuilders and shipowners have already a monopoly of our vast coastwise trade, which constitutes more than three-fourths of all of our shipping industry and is greater than that of any other country in the world. We had on June 30, 1900, in the coasting trade alone, 20,568 vessels, carrying 4,286,516 tons. This trade has been recently extended so as to include Cuba, Porto Rico, Mexico, Central America, the Sandwich Islands, and Alaska. The Government prohibits foreign ships from competing in this trade, and the ship builders and owners should certainly be satisfied with this extensive protection.

In the nature of things we can not prohibit foreign ships from entering our ports and competing with our own ships in the foreign trade, because we have, as I said, treaty obligations that prevent us from doing so, and if we should abrogate the treaties and prohibit these foreign ships from so competing, those same foreign nations would retaliate by imposing the same restrictions upon our ships, and we would gain nothing.

For my part I am glad our protection theories can not be made to extend across the sea and that our foreign competitors do keep down freight and passenger rates.

But the worst feature of this bill has not been mentioned, and that is that, while it pretends to be a bill to promote the commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States, it is so ingeniously worded as to give most of the subsidy of nine millions a year to the fast-going passenger steamers which carry very little freight; and only a very small part of this subsidy is left for the slow-going freighters that really transport most of our exports and imports across the sea.

The faster the steamer goes the more subsidy it gets. There is, first, a general subsidy given on all vessels of 1½ cents per gross ton for each 100 miles, not exceeding 1,500, sailed outward or homeward, and 1 cent per gross ton for each additional 100 miles sailed. Even under this clause passenger steamers will have a great advantage over freight steamers, because in the fast passenger steamers they will be paid on the amount of the gross tonnage of the vessel, and most of that tonnage space is taken up for passengers and mail accommodations.

In other words, the bill proposes to tax the people to pay these fast steamship lines a large bounty in addition to the profitable business in which they are engaged, of carrying the rich and well-to-do tourists over to Europe and back. But in addition to this general subsidy above named, there is a graduated scale of an additional subsidy for the larger and faster vessels. But this additional subsidy is to be given only to steam vessels of over 2,000 gross tons.

Clause (b) of section 1 reads thus:

Steam vessels of the following tonnages and capable of maintaining the following rates of speed, under the conditions hereinafter provided, shall, in addition to the compensation provided in clause (a) of this section, receive compensation per gross ton for each 100 nautical miles sailed outward bound at the rate hereinafter set forth and at 80 per cent thereof per gross ton for each 100 nautical miles sailed homeward bound, as follows, namely:

- Vessels over 2,000 tons:
- First. Eleven knots and less than 12 knots, four-tenths of 1 cent per gross ton.
- Second. Twelve knots and less than 13 knots, six-tenths of 1 cent per gross ton.
- Third. Thirteen knots and less than 14 knots, eight-tenths of 1 cent per gross ton.
- Fourth. Fourteen knots and less than 15 knots, 1 cent per gross ton.
- Fifth. Fifteen knots and less than 16 knots, 1.1 cents per gross ton.
- Sixth. Sixteen knots or over, 1.2 cents per gross ton.
- Vessels over 4,000 gross tons:
- Seventh. Seventeen knots and less than 18 knots, 1.4 cents per gross ton.
- Eighth. Eighteen knots and less than 19 knots, 1.6 cents per gross ton.
- Ninth. Nineteen knots or over, 1.8 cents per gross ton.
- Vessels over 10,000 gross tons:
- Tenth. Twenty knots and less than 21 knots, 2 cents per gross ton.
- Eleventh. Twenty-one knots or over, 2.3 cents per gross ton.

Now, it will be seen from an examination of the bill that these subsidies provided for in these eleven clauses are in addition to the general subsidy first named of 1½ cents per gross ton for the first 1,500 miles and 1 cent per gross ton for the remaining distance.

It will further be seen that this general subsidy can be earned only by vessels carrying a cargo of at least 50 per cent of their gross tonnage (clause (a) of section 1). But there is no provision requiring any vessels to carry any cargo whatever in order to earn the additional subsidies as set forth in the eleven clauses just enumerated (clause (b) of section 1).

It will be further seen that the amount of subsidy increases not in proportion to the cargo carried, but in proportion to the gross tonnage and speed of the vessel.

Mind you, the vessel does not have to make any particular speed except for a few hours in order to test its capacity for speed.

The steamer, when applying for subsidy, is to make a test of her speed—

for six continuous hours, steaming at sea, in ordinary weather, in water of sufficient depth to make the test a fair and just one. The registered speed shall be the average speed in nautical miles for six hours as determined by the above test.

So that if the steamer can run 21 knots an hour for the space of six hours, she is entitled to be registered as a 21-knot ship, and she will get a subsidy of 2.3 cents per gross ton for every hundred nautical miles she makes on the outward trip and 80 per cent thereof on the homeward trip, without regard to the actual speed she makes, in addition to the general subsidy and whether she carries any cargo or not.

Having been tested and registered, there is no provision in this bill that she shall preserve any particular speed. On the contrary, section 11 provides—

That when the steamer has been tested and classified, the classification herein provided for shall be maintained while such steamship shall be the subject of compensation, under the provisions of this act.

It is well known that the largest and fastest steamers, for which this bill is especially prepared, have the smallest cargo capacity.

Take, for example, the four great steamers of the International Navigation Company:

	Gross tonnage.	Net tonnage.	Cargo capacity in 40 feet.	50 per cent required by the act.
			Tons.	Tons.
New York.....	10,674	5,558	3,800	1,900
Paris, or Philadelphia.....	10,668	5,468	3,800	1,900
St. Louis.....	11,629	5,893	3,500	1,750
St. Paul.....	11,629	5,874	3,500	1,750

These are the figures given by that company itself, and if these steamers carry only 50 per cent of their net cargo capacity they get full subsidy, and whether they carry any cargo or not they get the two and three-tenths cents per gross ton under the eleventh paragraph of clause (b) in section 1.

These passenger steamers therefore, under this bill, would each receive from the Government a present of more than \$25,000 for every round trip they make. These steamers can easily make sixteen round trips a year, and would in the course of twelve months have presented to them by the taxpayers a splendid donation of about \$400,000 apiece.

The advocates of this bill admit that this class of passenger steamers would receive a bounty of more than \$300,000 a year for carrying a mere trifle of products to the foreign markets.

It is well known that most of the carrying trade across the sea is done in small, slow-going steam and sail vessels.

The citizens of the United States Government, on June 30, 1900, owned 23,333 vessels, and only 64 of these steam vessels in the foreign trade carried as much as 2,000 gross tons, and only 30 sail vessels had a gross tonnage of as much as 2,000 tons.

So that more than 23,000 of American vessels engaged in carrying our produce to market will get none of this subsidy set forth in the eleven subdivisions above named. None of the vessels engaged in our immense trade on the lakes or in our coastwise trade will get a dollar of this subsidy. None of our ships engaged in trade with Cuba, or Porto Rico, or the Sandwich Islands, or Canada, or Mexico, will get a dollar. None of the thousands of ships that really carry the products of our farms and factories to the European markets will get but a trifle, and most of them will get nothing at all.

The bill proceeds upon the idea of fulfilling the prophecy that "Unto him that hath shall be given; but from him that hath not shall be taken away even that which he hath."

The International Navigation Company is behind this scheme, and closely connected with that great corporation there are three or four other immense combines. The Standard Oil Company, the National Pipe Line Company, the National Transit Company, and five or six great millionaires control all of these companies.

Thus, John D. Rockefeller is president of the Standard Oil Company and is a director in the International Navigation Company. G. A. Griscom is a director in the Standard Oil Company and vice-president of the National Pipe Line Company; he is a director in the National Transit Company and president of the International Navigation Company. J. D. Archibald is a director in the Standard Oil Company and also a director in the National Transit Company and in the International Navigation Company. H. H. Rogers is vice-president of the Standard Oil Company, president of the National Pipe Line Company, and a director in the National Transit Company, and also a director in the International Navigation Company.

These four, Rockefeller, Griscom, Archibald, and Rogers, are the four paupers coming to Congress and asking alms at the hands of the people.

This is the same Griscom, at whose cottage by the sea the Republican national platform was written at Philadelphia, in 1900, where it was proclaimed:

The national defense and naval efficiency of this country supply a compelling reason for legislation which will enable us to recover our former place among the trade-carrying fleets of the world.

They were then bidding for some such scheme as this. It was

never meant by this clause in the platform to cut down the Dingley tariff bill so that our ships could come home loaded instead of empty. Because that same platform lauds the Dingley tariff, and calls attention to the large excess of exports over imports, as if that were a source of congratulation.

That part of the platform was written as a bid for subsidy. But very few voters at the polls had any conception of the numerous iniquities embodied in this pending measure.

This subsidy scheme is evidently prepared in the interest of a coterie of millionaire shipowners, in its provisions for allowing certain foreign-built ships to participate in the subsidy.

Clause (a), section 10, of this bill, admits to the subsidy at the rate of 50 per cent of that allowed to other vessels those foreign-built ships of Class A1 that were, on January 1, 1900, engaged in either freight or passenger business and were owned on that date, to the extent of a majority of the interest, by American citizens, so soon as the entire interest is acquired by American citizens.

Clause (b) of section 10 of the bill admits to participate in the subsidy such foreign-built ships of Class A1 as were under construction on January 1, 1900, for a citizen or citizens of the United States, provided such citizen or citizens will give bond to build within ten years new vessels of equal size and quality.

The absurdity and unfairness of those provisions are quite patent. Why should January 1, 1900, or any other particular date be fixed at which a majority interest in a ship should be owned by our citizens in order to entitle the ship to a share of the subsidy?

If a majority interest in a foreign-built ship should have been owned by American citizens on February 1, 1900, or at any other time after January 1, 1900, and although American citizens have since purchased and now own the entire ship, they can not obtain any of the subsidy, simply because they did not happen to own a majority interest on January 1, 1900. And again, under that clause (a) an American citizen could not get any subsidy if he owned the entire ship on January 1, and still owns all of it now, nor can he get any subsidy if he purchases an entire foreign ship at any time after January 1, 1900.

In other words, if our citizens happen to own most of the ship on January 1, 1900, and afterwards buy out the balance, he can get a subsidy on the whole ship; but if he owned most of the ship at any time since then, or if he owned all of it either before or since then, he gets nothing.

But clause (b) is equally unfair and absurd. If the ship was under construction on any other date since January 1, 1900, no subsidy is allowed. If under construction, even on that favorite date, for any other than our own citizens, no subsidy is allowed, although the interests have since been fully purchased by our citizens and the ship is completed for and owned by citizens of the United States.

If citizens of the United States or rich corporations can command capital enough to build two or more ships, then one half of them can be built abroad and the other half at home. But if he has only money enough to build one ship, he must build that one at home.

These absurdities and unfair provisions were not the result of carelessness or accident. This bill has been carefully prepared, and these clauses are the fruit of great pains and industry.

It would seem that there are certain persons and corporations who, on January 1, 1900, owned a majority interest in some foreign-built ships, and they also had under contract the construction of other ships on that date, and this bill has been carefully prepared so as to allow these parties to buy out the remaining interests in those partnership vessels, and to complete those others partly constructed, and to bring all of them under the United States registry, and these owners will then pocket a large part of this \$180,000,000. I wonder if those four great corporations own a majority interest in any ships and are having others constructed in foreign shipyards. Leading newspapers say these things are so; and if true, how beautifully worded is this bill to cover their particular situation.

Now, let me show you another absurdity in the very peculiar terms of this bill. It starts out with a great show of fairness, and in clause (a) of section 1 proposes to pay a subsidy on all sail or steam vessels of all classes or sizes, for not exceeding 16 entries in twelve months, of 1½ cents per gross ton for the first 1,500 miles and 1 cent per gross ton for the residue of the distance, and subsidy is to continue for ten years as to all vessels launched before January 1, 1900, and for twenty years as to all vessels launched after that date (less an annual deduction of 5 per cent after ten years, as set forth in section 3), provided they carry a cargo of 50 per cent of their gross tonnage.

I say this, at first, sounds fair, but when examined further the cloven foot appears; for clause (b) of section 1 gives a graduated scale of large additional subsidies, and these are confined to steam vessels of over 2,000 gross tons, and most all of our vessels now engaged in the foreign trade are vessels under 2,000 gross tons, and therefore only a few existing vessels are even promised any

of this additional subsidy under clause (b). But even that first subsidy promised in clause (a) is elsewhere taken away.

For when we turn to section 14 of the bill we find that none of the existing vessels are to receive any subsidy at all unless they execute a bond with good security that they will within five years build in the United States new vessels with gross tonnage of at least 25 per cent of the gross tonnage of the present vessels for which compensation is claimed. Now, bear in mind that only new steamships of over 2,000 gross tons are to receive any extra subsidy, and that to build one of these modern steel steamships of even that small size, to be of class A1, as required by this bill, will cost some \$250,000.

Now, we have at present engaged in the foreign trade 1,288 vessels, steam and sail (Report of Commissioner of Navigation, 1900, p. 416). Of these only 64 are steam vessels of over 2,000 gross tons and only 30 of them are sail vessels of over 2,000 gross tons, or a total of 94 (same report, pp. 173-177). So that we now have engaged in the foreign trade 1,194 steam and sail vessels, mostly owned by men of limited means, of less than 2,000 gross tons each.

They are not here clamoring for any subsidy, but are busily engaged in carrying our products to foreign markets, and doing it as cheaply as the large ocean liners are charging for the very same service.

And those 1,194 small ships are to get no subsidy at all, unless they do what they can not do—build a modern steam vessel of class A1 of more than 2,000 gross tons. So that all of the subsidy will go to the few large ships owned by rich corporations, and these will, with this large subsidy and the assistance of the railroads, underbid these numerous cheap vessels and drive them from the sea.

Then the few rich lines of subsidized steamers can combine, organize a trust, put up the freight rates to suit themselves, and the farmer and merchant will find that they have been taxed \$180,000,000 under the pretext of building up the merchant marine, and with the money subsidy sharks have destroyed that open competition which now exists upon the ocean.

The ocean carrying trade, like other great industries, is rapidly tending toward concentration under the control of a few great corporations, and even Mr. Chamberlain admits this tendency.

On page 16 of his report for 1900 he says:

The nature and extent of the centralization of the ownership of shipping may be more apparent to the eye from the following list of the 30 largest steamship companies, owning 5,616,074 tons out of 22,369,358 gross tons recorded in Lloyd's Register, or one-fourth of the world's steam tonnage.

The great corporations are urging this measure forward, and its enactment into a law will certainly accelerate that concentration.

The farmer, manufacturer, merchant, and everybody not in this ring will find that they asked for a fish and were given a serpent, and while asking for bread they were given a stone.

I have seen a variety of conclusions and guesses as to what amount of subsidy a single large steamship would get under this bill, and so I have taken the pains to make a calculation on one of them myself, and these figures I vouch to be correct.

Take, for example, the steamer *St. Louis*, of 11,629 gross tonnage, and allow her to make only one round trip a month from Philadelphia to Bremen, a distance of 3,650 miles. You will find that this one steamer will in one year earn in subsidy alone the enormous sum of \$333,671.16, not counting any of the subsidy she may earn in going from one foreign port to another, which is also allowed under the bill.

Here are the figures, and nobody can dispute their correctness:

There are 11,629 gross tons, at 1 cent each.....	\$116.29
One-half cent each gross ton	58.14

So the ship gets for each 100 miles up to 1,500 ..	174.43
And for the first 1,500 miles she gets 15 times that amount, or	2,616.45

But the ship has yet to sail 2,150 miles, for which she gets 1 cent per gross ton for each 100 miles.

One cent per gross ton we said is.....	\$116.29
--	----------

And this she gets for the first 100 miles over 1,500, and for the 2,150 miles she gets 21½ times that, or	2,500.23
Then add the subsidy for the first 1,500 miles.....	2,616.45

Total main subsidy, outward.....	5,116.68
Same amount homeward	5,116.68

Round trip main subsidy	10,233.36
-------------------------------	-----------

But this is a steamship of 21 knots and of over 10,000 gross tons, so that under the bill she gets 2.3 cents per gross ton extra for her entire trip outward and 80 per cent of that amount for her entire trip homeward.

2.3 cents per ton on 11,629 tons	\$267.46
--	----------

Amount of extra subsidy on each 100 miles and on the entire distance outward of 3,650 miles.....	9,763.54
Then 80 per cent of this homeward.....	7,810.03

Extra subsidy, round trip.....	17,572.57
Main subsidy, round trip	10,233.36

Total subsidy, each round trip	27,805.93
And for the 12 round trips which the ship can easily make in a year	333,671.16

The International Navigation Company owns this ship and many others, and that rich corporation is running these ships not for patriotism nor fun, but for the money there is in the business.

Tell me, in the name of all that is decent, how much money did this corporation contribute to the last national campaign fund?

It must have been enormous, or you would crimson at the mere suggestion of donating more than \$300,000 a year to this great corporation for each of its large steamers. This company is already making money or it would quit the business.

It is quite significant, by the way, that the Commissioner of Navigation has, on page 16 of his report for 1900, tabulated the amount of capital stock, dividends, and profits of about thirty of the leading navigation companies in the world. But he makes no report about the dividends and profits of this great American company. This company is named, but the columns are blank all the way through.

I say these blanks are very significant or the company would not otherwise suppress the figures. But suppose it is not making money. Then it is because of the low freight and passenger rates in the ocean carrying trade. It is because the ocean is the great highway of the world, and all the nations, with all kinds of vessels, come into our ports and bid to carry our freight.

And it is this competition and these cheap rates this bill seeks to destroy by driving smaller and cheaper vessels from the sea and giving a monopoly to a few great corporations.

Look for a moment at the utter lack of logic shown by the advocates of this measure. They contend that the slight differences in wages paid and the cost of construction have driven American merchant ships from the sea, and in the next breath propose to pay large subsidies to some ships and much smaller subsidies to others, and to others none at all, and yet argue that the more favored ships will have no advantage over the less favored ones, and that all alike will be encouraged.

The freedom of this great country, and for which she stands out in contrast against all the other governments of antiquity, means more than the mere right to make and execute our own laws. It means a destruction of those foolish customs and laws by which mankind have been trammelled in all past ages. We are the great iconoclasts of the earth, and the great destroyers of the household gods that have been venerated through the centuries. We have demolished the fetich known as the divine right of kings, and we have taught the world the most valuable of all lessons—that the people are capable of governing themselves, and that the best government is the one that gives an equal chance to every citizen and affords to every one the equal protection of the laws.

We have torn up by the roots the venerated doctrine of castes and established schools for all the children, and we should offer equal opportunities alike to the humblest and the greatest. But the greatest freedom we enjoy and the greatest lesson we have taught mankind is the right to pursue any honest occupation we please, and achieve by our own efforts that measure of success that comes to skill, energy, and enterprise, unobstructed by governmental interference and unaided by governmental favoritism. We have taught mankind that there is no place in a free government for the idle stipendiary who receives alms as a recompense for his purple blood or ancient lineage. We jeer at that divinity that was thought to hedge about a king and we proclaim a new and modern aristocracy of working people. And it is a step back toward the ancient and the obsolete, it is an insult to the skill, enterprise, and industry of American citizenship, for this coterie of shipowners and shipbuilders to come here asking alms at the hands of this Congress. It is false and preposterous, this contention that we can not build ships and operate them cheaper and better than any other country under the sun. The great march of modern progress began by the destruction of privilege and privileged classes. The Sans-culottes who marched out to Versailles and invited the king to come to town; the ragamuffins who sang the Marseillaise—these were the pioneers of French progress.

They put an end to those royal deadbeats who drew salaries from the public treasury while their own vast estates were exempt from taxation. These ragamuffins put an end to those gilded and powdered statesmen who sat for months debating questions of

etiquette for the court. We are not likely to go as far wrong as did the hardheaded Bourbons, and we are not likely soon, at least, to have as bloody a reckoning. But why start in that direction at all? Every subsidy voted to help private citizens in their private business is a stride toward building up that same old privileged class that in some form or other has in every age proved a curse to human liberty.

Let me say in conclusion that this strong, young nation can be prosperous for a while and at the same time violate and disregard many of the laws of national health and well-being. But to the nation, as to the man, a time of reckoning comes, and as to both it is written, "Whatsoever a man soweth that shall he also reap." It seems to me that Congressional favoritism to syndicates and rich corporations could not be shown with more shameless effrontery than is presented by the terms of this bill. You are proposing to add millions to the fortunes of the rich by making still harder the crust of the poor.

This bill, with trumpet tongue, proclaims more taxes to be levied upon the plebeian to add to the feast of Lucullus.

Continue in this course, and I warn you that the day of reckoning will come.

The moving finger writes; and having writ,
Moves on; nor all your piety nor wit
Shall lure it back to cancel half a line,
Nor all your tears wash out a word of it.

[Applause.]

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, how much time is there on the other side remaining?

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty-two minutes, under the control of the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. SULZER. I trust the gentleman will occupy some of his time.

Mr. HULL. I have no disposition, Mr. Chairman, to use any time. I understand that I have thirty-two minutes remaining.

The CHAIRMAN. Twenty-two minutes.

Mr. HULL. My understanding is it is thirty-two minutes; but I have no disposition to take the time, and if the gentleman from New York has concluded his part of the time I ask that we now proceed with the reading of the bill under the five-minute rule.

Mr. SULZER. Mr. Chairman, I have no objection to that.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

PAY OF ENLISTED MEN.

For pay of enlisted men of all grades, including recruits, \$14,000,000.
For additional pay for length of service for all enlisted men, exclusive of Hospital Corps, \$1,000,000: *Provided*, That hereafter all allotments of pay of enlisted men of the United States Army, under section 16 of act of Congress approved March 2, 1899, that have been or shall be paid to the designated allottees, after the expiration of one month subsequent to the month in which said allotments accrued, shall pass to the credit of the disbursing officer who has made or shall make such payment: *Provided*, That said disbursing officer shall, before making payment of said allotments, use, or shall have used, due diligence in obtaining and making use of all information that may have been received in the War Department relative to the grantors of the allotments: *And provided further*, That if an erroneous payment is made because of the failure of an officer responsible for such report to report, in the manner prescribed by the Secretary of War, the death of a grantor or any fact which renders the allotment not payable, then the amount of such erroneous payment shall be collected by the Paymaster-General from the officer who fails to make such report, if such collection is practicable: *Provided*, That enlistments in the Regular Army on and after April 21, 1898, from which date war was declared to have existed between the United States and Spain, up to and including April 20, 1898, shall be deemed enlistments for the war with Spain and shall entitle men so enlisting to the extra pay and on the same conditions granted to men who enlisted in the Regular Army subsequent to the declaration of war, for the war only, as provided by an act approved March 3, 1899, entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Regular and Volunteer Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1900."

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I wish to offer an amendment to come in after the words "nineteen hundred," in line 12.

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 6, at the end of line 12, insert the following:
"That the provisions of section 1 of the act of January 12, 1899, be extended so as to apply to all officers and enlisted men authorized by the act of March 2, 1899, who served honestly and faithfully beyond the limits of the United States: *Provided*, That all officers and enlisted men authorized by said act of March 2, 1899, who have heretofore or may hereafter be discharged in advance of muster out of their respective organizations in consequence of wounds or physical disabilities, shall receive an amount, in addition to the amount paid on discharge, which shall make the total sum paid equivalent to two months' extra pay and travel pay from San Francisco to the place of acceptance of commission, if an officer, or place of enlistment, if an enlisted man."

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. I want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts that if he will strike out the proviso I will not make the point of order against it; but that proviso goes too far, and I will not consent to that going into the bill without its introduction into the House as an independent proposition, when the House can have an opportunity to fully consider it.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I will consent to the withdrawal of the latter part of the amendment if the gentleman from Iowa, the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, will insist on his point of order against the whole section, provided

this is not done. I do not wish to endanger that portion of the amendment which provides for the payment of two months' extra pay to the men now serving in the Philippines. Two months' additional pay was given to the men who served in the Spanish-American war who enlisted for the war only, through an amendment to the Army appropriation bill which I offered in the Fifty-fifth Congress, and I desire the same consideration for the men who are now doing our fighting in the Philippines, both regular and volunteer.

This extra two months' pay should be given to all the soldiers, the regular as well as the volunteer; and if it were not for the fact that members of the Military Affairs Committee have informed me of their intention to make a point of order if this was done, the effect of which would be to strike out the whole paragraph, I would so frame my amendment.

I did not see any reason why any discrimination should have been made against the regular who served in the Spanish-American war when the additional two months' pay was being voted upon in the Fifty-fifth Congress, and I can not see any reason now why he should not receive the two months' extra pay.

I intend bringing this matter up before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs, in the hope that the amendments may be enlarged so as to give to all men, soldiers and officers, regular and volunteer alike, who have served during either the Spanish-American or Philippine war the extra pay; two months' extra pay to those whose service extended beyond the bounds of the United States and one month's extra pay to those serving within the United States.

I hope the gentleman from Iowa will not object, after he has given the matter proper consideration, to my offering the latter part of the amendment which I have just asked to be withdrawn, at some other stage of the bill.

Surely he will admit if an enlisted man or officer retires from active duty by reason of wounds or disability, he is entitled to the extra two months' pay and travel pay to his home.

I think the enlisted men in the Army are grossly underpaid, and if I had my way the men who bear the brunt of the battle, who endure the hardships and fatigue incident to fighting in a tropical and unhealthy country against an insidious and guerrilla method of warfare, would receive at least \$25 per month. [Applause.]

In accordance with the suggestion of the gentleman from Iowa, and in order that the whole paragraph may not go out on a point of order, I withdraw all after the words "United States," in line 7. If the House will not give its consent to the admission of this provision at some later section of the bill, I will press the matter before the Senate Committee on Military Affairs.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the end of line 12 add the following:

"That the provisions of section 1 of the act of January 12, 1899, be extended so as to apply to all officers and enlisted men authorized by the act of March 2, 1899, who served honestly and faithfully beyond the limits of the United States."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of 42 veterinarians, at \$1,500, \$63,000.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment in line 4, page 13, after the word "dollars:"

Provided, That 12 of the veterinarians herein provided for may be assigned to the artillery.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Provided, That 12 of the veterinarians herein provided for may be assigned to the artillery.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For mileage to officers and contract surgeons, when authorized by law, \$500,000: *Provided*, That hereafter officers so traveling shall be paid 7 cents per mile and no more; distances to be computed and mileage to be paid over the shortest usually traveled routes, with deduction as hereinafter provided; and payment and settlement of mileage accounts of officers shall be made according to distances and deductions computed over routes established and by mileage tables prepared by the Paymaster-General of the Army under the direction of the Secretary of War; and all payments made by paymasters on account of mileage previous to the passage of this act shall be settled in accordance with distance tables officially promulgated and in use at date of payment. The Secretary of War may determine what shall constitute travel and duty "without troops" within the meaning of the laws governing the payment of mileage and commutation of quarters to officers of the Army: *Provided further*, That officers who so desire may, upon application to the Quartermaster's Department, be furnished with transportation requests, exclusive of sleeping and parlor car accommodations, for the entire journey under their orders; and the transportation so furnished shall be a charge against the officer's mileage account, to be deducted at the rate of 3 cents per mile by the paymaster paying the account, and of the amount so deducted there shall be turned over to an authorized officer of the Quartermaster's Department 3 cents per mile for transportation furnished over any railroad which is not a free, bond-aided, or 50 per cent land-grant railroad for the

credit of the appropriation for transportation of the Army and its supplies: *And provided further*, That when the established route of travel shall, in whole or in part, be over the line of any railroad on which the troops and supplies of the United States are entitled to be transported free of charge, or over any of the bond-aided Pacific railroads, or over any 50 per cent land-grant railroad, officers traveling as herein provided for shall, for the travel over such roads, be furnished with transportation requests, exclusive of sleeping and parlor car accommodations, by the Quartermaster's Department: *And provided further*, That when transportation is furnished by the Quartermaster's Department, or when the established route of travel is over any of the railroads above specified, there shall be deducted from the officer's mileage account by the paymaster paying the same 3 cents per mile for the distance for which transportation has been or should have been furnished: *And provided further*, That actual expenses only shall be paid to officers for sea travel when traveling, as herein provided for, to, from, or between our island possessions: *Provided also*, That hereafter when an officer shall be discharged from the service, except by way of punishment for an offense, he shall receive for travel allowances from the place of his discharge to the place of his residence at the time of his appointment or to the place of his original muster into the service 4 cents per mile; and an enlisted man when discharged from the service, except by way of punishment for an offense, shall receive 4 cents per mile from the place of his discharge to the place of his enlistment, enrollment, or original muster into the service: *Provided further*, That any officer or enlisted man in the service of the United States who was discharged in the Philippine Islands and there reentered the service through commission or enlistment shall, when discharged, except by way of punishment for an offense, receive for travel allowances from the place of his discharge to the place in the United States of his last preceding appointment or enlistment, 4 cents per mile: *Provided further*, That for sea travel on discharge, to, from, or between our island possessions, actual expenses only shall be paid to officers and transportation and subsistence only shall be furnished to enlisted men.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment to that paragraph, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I wish to reserve a point of order to this.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts desires to reserve a point of order prior to the amendment.

Mr. HULL. I think, Mr. Chairman, we had better dispose of the point of order first.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas will lie on the table for the present. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts raise the point of order to the entire paragraph?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I raise the point of order, Mr. Chairman, to get some explanation from the chairman of the committee.

Mr. HULL. What does the gentleman desire information on?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I would like to ask what change of law is made in this paragraph?

Mr. HULL. I will state to the House the changes in detail. In line 14, page 14, the word "hereafter" is inserted, with the hope that we can fix this mileage so that we shall not have to put it into the appropriation bill each year. In line 19, in the words "accounts of officers shall be made according to distances and deductions computed over routes established and by mileage tables prepared by the Paymaster-General of the Army, under the direction of the Secretary of War," there is a change by putting in the additional words. Under the act as we passed it last year the mileage tables of the War Department were made the basis by which the Paymaster can pay the troops. There has been some little difference between the Comptroller and the War Department on this matter of deduction; and this language is put in by the consent of the Auditor for the War Department and the Pay Department agreeing on what they shall do.

One reason why the mileage tables of the War Department should govern is this: You can not change the mileage tables very often, because it takes months to prepare them and months to publish them, and a large expense to get them out. They are the basis under the law, as we have passed it heretofore, for the paymaster in settling with the troops and officers. Now when the Comptroller makes a change it changes the entire system of mileage for the War Department, and this measure puts it on the shortest usually traveled route, but makes the War Department tables final.

The words "and contract road" are left out, for the reason that you can not tell from month to month what is a contract road, as it is constantly changing schedule that makes utterly worthless the tables prepared by the War Department on mileage. A road may be a contract road to-day and out of contract to-morrow. If they have to take it over the shortest usually traveled route it protects the Government.

I am going on through this paragraph, with the consent of the gentleman from Massachusetts. The next new legislation is line 25, where it says the Secretary may determine what shall constitute travel and duty "without troops" within the meaning of the laws governing the payment of mileage and commutation of quarters to officers of the Army. That is put in for the reason that for the first time in the history of the Government the Comptroller has decided that one man, an orderly going with an officer, is traveling "with troops," and therefore he should have no mileage at all. I think that every man will recognize the absurdity of that. An officer is ordered from here to Chicago for the purpose of commencing recruiting, and he takes an orderly

with him. They all need an orderly; they have got to have one. He takes the sergeant with him, and under the recent decision of the Comptroller he is not allowed mileage. This leaves it to the Secretary of War to determine what is traveling with or without troops. That is all, and it seems to me it is a wise and necessary provision.

On the commutation of quarters part, at all the recruiting stations one soldier with the officer deprives him of commutation of quarters. The only way they can get around that is to hire a civilian and abolish the custom of having an orderly, which they need, or a sergeant and a corporal, at a recruiting station. Take it at the department headquarters at San Francisco or St. Paul, and I think even in Washington, under the decision they do not dare to have a private soldier, enlisted and paid by the Government, to perform any duties at headquarters if they are to have commutation.

As I said a while ago, this is the first time in the whole history of the Government that the Comptroller has held this. But when the Comptroller of the Treasury does hold anything it is easier to change the laws of the Medes and Persians than to change a decision of a Comptroller of the Treasury. My understanding is that this is satisfactory to the Secretary and the Department. The Comptroller, as I say, holds that under the present law one soldier with an officer is traveling with troops. An officer may be sent from one part of the country to another on duty. I think gentlemen will see that if he has only one soldier with him he is not traveling with troops.

Now, in line 11, page 15, the words "and of" are put in. That does not need any explanation.

Beginning with line 13, gentlemen will find a provision for "3 cents per mile for transportation furnished over any railroad which is not a free, bond-aided, or 50 per cent land-grant railroad."

That is new; but I do not remember the reason for it. The provision applying to "50 per cent land-grant railroads" is new. We simply strike out the contract roads; that is the whole object. We struck out those, as I said a while ago, because they are constantly changing; and the mileage tables, prepared at great expense and with great care, are utterly worthless in the event of such changes as there were last year.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I call the gentleman's attention to the language on pages 16 and 17.

Mr. HULL. That is the same that we have now. On page 20 will be found this proviso:

Provided also, That hereafter when an officer shall be discharged from the service, except by way of punishment for an offense, he shall receive for travel allowances from the place of his discharge to the place of his residence.

And so forth.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. What is the existing law?

Mr. HULL. We passed a bill the other day giving this to three regiments, because one of them had just been brought back. Our reason for putting this provision in the bill was to cover any individual cases that might arise in other regiments. The bill passed the other day by unanimous consent gave this to three regiments, because the bulk of the enlistments were in those regiments.

Let me explain the reason for this provision. A man first enlists, for instance, in Nashville, Tenn.; he goes to the Philippines and serves his term of enlistment. He reenlists. Those soldiers who have heretofore enlisted from Tennessee have had a contract with the Government that they shall be paid in addition to the mileage that they receive at the time of their enlistment full mileage to the place of their original enlistment. We inserted that provision here to obviate the necessity of passing hereafter legislation covering those individual cases. If we had had time when the other bill was before the House two or three days ago we would have put in these provisions in lieu of the provision which came to us from the Senate. But there was a regiment then at San Francisco being mustered out, and that bill was passed to cover that particular regiment and two others. But in many cases men have enlisted in other regiments, and if some provision of this kind is not made they will be discharged at San Francisco without any payment for transportation to their homes, because the place of their enlistment the second time under the regular law would be Manila.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I take it, from what the chairman has said, that his committee has investigated this question of mileage thoroughly. I am not speaking now about the proposition in regard to soldiers going to the Philippines. I am speaking of the alteration in the law of mileage. That, I understand, the committee has investigated thoroughly.

Mr. HULL. We have investigated it for the last four or five years.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. And you believe the law should be changed in the manner indicated?

Mr. HULL. We believe that with this proposed change we shall have very little trouble with this matter hereafter.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. The gentleman knows that I

made some little investigation of this matter myself at the Department, and it seems to me the saving in printing mileage tables would probably more than make up for whatever extra expense there might be under the law as changed.

Mr. HULL. Without this change I think great difficulty might arise. It might be impossible to furnish paymasters with mileage tables, because they could not be gotten out rapidly enough to keep up with the changes.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. In view of the gentleman's statements and of the committee's full investigation of the subject, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will again report the amendment of the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE].

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after "enlistment," in line 1, page 17, the words "or to his home, if he was appointed or enlisted at a place other than his home."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For additional 10 per cent increase on pay of officers serving at foreign stations, \$500,000: *Provided*, That hereafter the pay proper of all officers and enlisted men serving beyond the limits of the States comprising the Union, and the Territories of the United States contiguous thereto, shall be increased 10 per cent for officers and 20 per cent for enlisted men over and above the rates of pay proper as fixed by law for time of peace, and the time of such service shall be counted from the date of departure from said States to the date of return thereto: *Provided further*, That the officers and enlisted men who have served in China at any time since the 26th day of May, 1900, shall be allowed and paid for such service the same increase of pay proper as is herein provided for.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I reserve a point of order on this paragraph until I can hear some explanation of it.

Mr. HULL. By previous legislation we allowed to enlisted men serving in Cuba, Porto Rico, Alaska, and the Philippines 20 per cent additional pay, and to officers serving in those localities 10 per cent additional. This did not cover the cases of officers and men ordered from the Philippines to China. By reason of the specific provision I have named, this extra pay was denied to men ordered from the Philippines to China, although subjected in China to harder work and greater dangers than soldiers serving in the Philippines. In making the change embodied in this paragraph we had no purpose except to cover just such cases.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. CANNON. There is in this paragraph, I think, an oversight, to which, if I had time, I would call the attention of the chairman of the committee. But I offer an amendment which I think will explain itself.

The amendment of Mr. CANNON was read, as follows:

To the paragraph last read add the following:

Provided further, That enlisted men receiving or entitled to the 20 per cent increased pay herein authorized shall not be entitled to or receive any increased compensation for what is known as extra or special duty."

Mr. HULL. I have no objection to that amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

All the money hereinbefore appropriated shall be disbursed and accounted for by the Pay Department as pay of the Army, and for that purpose shall constitute one fund.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I offer the amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert after "appropriated," in line 13, page 18, the words "except the appropriation for mileage of officers where authorized by law."

Mr. HULL. I have no objection to that.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SUBSISTENCE DEPARTMENT.

Subsistence of the Army: Purchase of subsistence supplies: For issue, as rations to troops, civil employees when entitled thereto, hospital matrons and nurses, general prisoners of war (including Indians held by the Army as prisoners, but for whose subsistence appropriation is not otherwise made); for sales to officers and enlisted men of the Army; for authorized issues of candles; of toilet articles, barbers', laundry, and tailors' materials, for use of general prisoners confined at military posts without pay or allowances, and recruits at recruiting stations; of matches for lighting public fires and lights at posts and stations and in the field; of flour used for paste in target practice; of salt and vinegar for public animals; of issues to Indians employed with the Army, without pay, as guides and scouts, and for toilet paper for use by enlisted men at post camps, rendezvous, and officers, where water-closets are provided with sewer connections. For payments: For meals for recruiting parties and recruits; for hot coffee, canned beef, and baked beans for troops traveling, when it is impracticable to cook their rations; for scales, weights, measures, utensils, tools, stationery, blank books and forms, printing, advertising, commercial newspapers, use of telephones, office furniture; for temporary buildings, cellars, and other means of protecting subsistence supplies (when not provided by the Quartermaster's Department); for coffee roasters and coffee mills; for commissary chests, complete, and for renewal of their outfits; for field desks of commissaries; for extra pay to enlisted men employed on extra duty in the Subsistence Department for periods of not less than ten days, at rates fixed by law; for compensation of civilians employed in the Subsistence Department, and for other necessary expenses incident to the purchase, care, preservation, issue, sale, and accounting for subsistence supplies for the Army. For the payment of the regulation allowances for commutation in lieu of rations: To enlisted men on furlough, to ordnance sergeants on duty at ungarrisoned posts, to enlisted men stationed at places where rations in kind can not be economic-

ally issued, to enlisted men traveling on detached duty when it is impracticable to carry rations of any kind, to enlisted men selected to contest for places or prizes in department and army rifle competitions while traveling to and from places of contest; to be expended under the direction of the Secretary of War, \$12,000,000.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend the bill in line 22, page 18, after the semicolon, by inserting the words "military convicts at posts." I do that for the reason that the military prison at Leavenworth is now abolished and a large number of soldiers suffering from the verdicts of courts-martial are kept at posts, and it is a question whether the Department has a right to expend any portion of this fund for them unless these words are inserted.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert on page 18, line 22, after the semicolon, the words "military convicts at posts."

Mr. HULL. And then a semicolon after that.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HULL. Now, in lines 5 and 6, page 19, there is a misprint. What was intended by the committee was to put in the word "posts" with a comma, "camps" with a comma, "rendezvous and offices," not "officers."

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the clerical errors indicated by the gentleman from Iowa will be corrected by the Clerk.

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. In line 9, page 19, the words "canned beef" should be stricken out and the words "canned meats" inserted. I move to make that amendment. That is not a clerical error, but it was a mistake in the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the word "beef" and insert the word "meats" in lieu thereof.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HULL. In line 16 the words "and coffee mills" should be stricken out for the reason that that belongs in the Quartermaster's Department.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, on page 20, line 8, after the word "contest," there should be inserted the words "and to male and female nurses on leave of absence."

Since the estimates were made for this bill we have created a corps of female nurses without abolishing entirely the male nurses, and these words are necessary in order to enable both classes to be provided for.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "contest," in line 8, page 20, insert the words "and to male and female nurses on leave of absence."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase of 100 pounds of ice, at not to exceed 30 cents per 100 pounds, per day for each organization (company, troop, battery, or band) stationed in our insular possessions where ice can be furnished, estimated at 500 organizations, three hundred and sixty-five days, at not to exceed 30 cents per day, \$54,750.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, since the insertion of this provision the War Department has called the attention of the committee to the fact that it might defeat its whole purpose by making a mathematical computation on this ice, and have recommended us simply to appropriate for the ice; therefore I move to strike out lines 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 9 and to insert:

For ice for organizations of enlisted men stationed in island possessions where ice can be furnished, \$54,750.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 21, lines 3 to 9, inclusive, strike out the paragraph and insert:

"For ice for organizations of enlisted men stationed in island possessions where ice can be furnished, \$54,750."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Incidental expenses: Postage, cost of telegrams on official business received and sent by officers of the Army; extra pay to soldiers employed on extra duty, under the direction of the Quartermaster's Department, in the erection of barracks, quarters, and storehouses, in the construction of roads, and other constant labor for periods of not less than ten days, and as clerks for post quartermasters at military posts, and for prison overseers at posts designated by the War Department for the confinement of general prisoners; for expenses of express to and from frontier posts and armies in the field, of escorts to paymasters and other disbursing officers and to trains where military escorts can not be furnished; expenses of the interment of officers killed in action or who die when on duty in the field, or at military posts or on the frontiers, or when traveling under orders, and of noncommissioned officers and soldiers; and that in all cases where they would have been lawful claims against the Government reimbursement may be made of expenses heretofore or hereafter incurred by individuals of burial and transportation of remains of officers, including acting assistant surgeons, not to exceed what is now allowed in the cases of officers, and for the reimbursement in the cases of enlisted men of what is now allowed in their cases may be paid out of the proper funds appropriated by this act, and that the disbursing officers shall be credited with such reimbursement heretofore made; authorized office furniture; hire of laborers in the Quartermaster's Department, including the hire of interpreters, spies, or guides for the Army; compensation of clerks

and other employees to the officers of the Quartermaster's Department, and incidental expenses of recruiting; for the apprehension, securing, and delivering of deserters and the expenses incident to their pursuit, and no greater sum than \$50 for each deserter shall, in the discretion of the Secretary of War, be paid to any civil officer or citizen for such services and expenses; for a donation of \$5 to each dishonorably discharged prisoner upon his release from confinement under court martial sentence involving dishonorable discharge; for the following expenditures required for the several regiments of cavalry, the batteries of light artillery, and such companies of infantry and scouts as may be mounted, the authorized number of officers' horses, and for the trains, to wit: Hire of veterinary surgeons, purchase of medicines for horses and mules, picket ropes, blacksmiths' tools and materials, horseshoes and blacksmiths' tools for the cavalry service, and for the shoeing of horses and mules, and such additional expenditures as are necessary and authorized by law in the movements and operations of the Army and at military posts, and not expressly assigned to any other department, \$2,400,000.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment that has not been submitted to the Committee on Military Affairs, because we have not had an opportunity to pass upon it. In line 15, page 23, after the word "made," insert the words:

Provided, That hereafter no reimbursements shall be made of such expenses incurred prior to the 21st day of April, 1898.

And I want to say, Mr. Chairman, that since we passed this bill to reimburse, a great many claims are being filed going back to the civil war, and the Comptroller of the Treasury holds that under the law as we passed it at the last session it opens up all these claims, and we shall enter upon a sea of investigation that nobody dreamed of when we passed the law last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 15, page 23, after the word "made," insert:

"Provided, That hereafter no reimbursement shall be made of such expenses incurred prior to the 21st day of April, 1898."

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, before that amendment is acted on I should like to ask the chairman of the committee if the section just read makes the appropriations under which authority is granted to pay the amount of \$35 toward the funeral expenses of each enlisted soldier and \$75 toward the funeral expenses of each officer?

Mr. HULL. It involves the expenses. I do not know that it says the exact amount. It is an exact reproduction of the law passed at the last session up to this point. I want to say very frankly that unless there is a provision to limit this matter in this way I shall move to strike out the whole thing.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will it be in order to offer an amendment after I have submitted some remarks upon this matter of appropriation for removing the remains of enlisted men and officers who die in the service?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is now discussing the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I can offer another amendment after the amendment of the gentleman from Iowa has been disposed of?

The CHAIRMAN. Certainly.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I hold in my hand at the present time a statement from the Quartermaster-General in reply to a letter which I wrote him in December last, in regard to a claim submitted by one Julia E. Roberts for the \$35 which is authorized by law to be paid to the family or the next of kin of a deceased soldier. The Department replied in answer to that request that the \$35 had been spent in providing a zinc-lined casket to take the remains of that soldier from the Philippine Islands to this country, and that no further expenditure could be allowed.

Now, Mr. Chairman, in the consular and diplomatic appropriation bill which passed this House yesterday, there is, on page 9, an appropriation of \$5,000 for defraying the expenses of transporting the remains of diplomatic and consular officers of the United States, including consular clerks; and not only are the actual expenses incurred in the shipment of the bodies from different parts of the world paid by the United States Government, but the actual funeral expenses when those bodies have been brought to this country and buried, are paid.

Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that when a mother or a father sends a boy in the full blush and vigor of manhood, as is required by the regulations of enlistment in the United States Army, into the service of the United States, and that man goes four, five, or six thousand miles away to fight for his country at \$15 a month, if that boy is killed or dies of disease, and his body is returned, the United States Government ought to pay some portion of the burial expenses.

And I submit, Mr. Chairman, that I do not think it is fair for the chairman of the committee to make any objection to a provision of this kind when the United States Government is on record and has made an appropriation within twenty-four hours to pay all the expenses incidental to the burial of men in the consular service who receive from one thousand to ten thousand dollars a year, while the soldier who fights for the protection of this Government and the honor of the American flag at \$15 a month is buried at the expense of his family or nearest of kin.

Four months and in some cases more than a year's time elapses between the time of last payment to the soldier and the arrival in this country of his body, yet the family or friends are supposed to pay the entire cost of burial, except a zinc-lined casket. The United States Government takes him in the full vigor of a splendid manhood and after he has valiantly served his country, fought for its flag, and died in its defense, his body is sent back like so much clay, uncared for, unhonored, and unnoticed.

I ask the House to vote for this provision, which does not mean much to this Government, but which is a good deal to the poor family or relatives of Uncle Sam's fighting guard.

Mr. HULL. I suppose the gentleman realizes that the committee with which I am connected has nothing to do with the question which the gentleman is discussing. This amendment only provides that we shall not go back forty years and take up old claims that might now be trumped up, when there is no opportunity whatever to test the validity of them.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I wish to offer an amendment.

Mr. HULL. I ask that my amendment be passed on before the gentleman submits another, because his does not apply to the same thing.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I think my amendment does apply.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman offer an amendment to the amendment?

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman offers an amendment to the amendment.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. After the word "made," in line 15 on page 23.

The CHAIRMAN. There is pending an amendment to come in there.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I will add that amendment to the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers the following amendment to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa:

The Clerk read as follows:

Add to the amendment the following:

"And of this amount \$35 shall be paid to the family or next of kin of each enlisted man, and \$75 to the family or next of kin of each officer, outside of any money spent by the Government in the transportation of the remains of such enlisted man or officer."

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order upon that.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. If that is subject to the point of order, your amendment is certainly subject to the point of order.

Mr. HULL. It is not germane at all to the amendment that I offered, to begin with.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Your amendment is not germane, because you go back forty years.

Mr. HULL. If it should go in, it should not go in at this place. I want to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts here is a provision which seems to me does not limit it to \$35:

And that in all cases where they would have lawful claims against the Government reimbursement may be made of expenses heretofore or hereafter incurred by individuals of burial and transportation of remains of officers, including acting assistant surgeons, not to exceed what is now allowed in case of officers and for the reimbursement in the cases of enlisted men of what is now allowed in their cases.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Not to exceed \$35.

Mr. HULL. Why not put that in there? This amendment, in my judgment, would carry with it pay to next of kin, whether they had paid a dollar or not. There are a great many next of kin that do not pay anything.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I will amend the amendment in that way, so as to put it in where the gentleman suggests.

Mr. HULL. It is best not to have it placed where you are now offering it.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I will withdraw the amendment at the request of the gentleman from Iowa, chairman of the committee, and ask that it be added at another portion of this paragraph, provided he agrees not to make a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Iowa, which the Clerk has heretofore reported.

The question was taken; and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. Now I understand, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman suggests that I offer the amendment after the word "incur," to insert "not to exceed \$35."

Mr. HULL. What line?

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. In line 8. I wish to have the amendment which has just been read by the Clerk inserted after the word "incur," in line 8.

Mr. HULL. Let us have it read, so as to see what it means.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert in line 8, after the word "incur," on page 23, the following amendment:

"Of this amount \$35 shall be paid to the family or next of kin of each enlisted man and \$15 to the family or next of kin of each officer outside of any money spent by the United States in the transportation of the remains of the said enlisted man or officer."

Mr. HULL. I want to reserve a point of order upon that. It does not seem to fit.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I will make it "legal representative," in place of next of kin. [After a pause.] Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that we pass over this paragraph without prejudice, so that the amendment may be offered at another time. I think I can so change the language as to cover the point and still have it unobjectionable to the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman withdraws the amendment and asks unanimous consent that this paragraph may be passed over, reserving to him the right to offer an amendment.

Mr. HULL. I have no objection to that. As the gentleman has got the present amendment it would not do.

There was no objection.

Mr. HULL. Now, Mr. Chairman, in line 20 on page 23, I move to insert the words "including escaped military prisoners" after the word "deserters."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 20, after the word "deserters," insert "including escaped military prisoners."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HULL. I offer another amendment. In line 22, after the word "deserter," insert the words "or escaped military prisoner."

The Clerk read as follows:

In line 22, after the word "deserter," insert "or escaped military prisoner."

The amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

MEDICAL DEPARTMENT.

Medical and Hospital Department: For the purchase of medical and hospital supplies, including disinfectants for military posts, camps, hospitals, hospital ships, and transports; for the purchase, installation, operation, and maintenance of ice-making plants; for expenses of medical supply depots; for medical care and treatment not otherwise provided for of officers and enlisted men of the Army, and of prisoners of war and other persons in military custody or confinement, under such regulations as shall have been or shall be prescribed by the Secretary of War; for the proper care and treatment of epidemic and contagious diseases in the Army or at military posts or stations, including measures to prevent the spread thereof, and the payment of reasonable damages not otherwise provided for for clothing and bedding injured or destroyed in such prevention; for the pay of male and female nurses, cooks, and other civilians employed for the proper care of sick officers and soldiers, under such regulations fixing their number, assignment, pay, and allowances as shall have been or shall be prescribed by the Secretary of War, and disbursing officers of the Army shall be credited with all payments heretofore or to be hereafter made by them in accordance with such regulations; for the pay of civilian physicians employed to examine physically applicants for enlistment and enlisted men, and to render other professional services from time to time under proper authority; for the pay of other employees of the Medical Department; for the payment of express companies and local transfers employed directly by the Medical Department for the transportation of medical and hospital supplies, including bidders' samples and water for analysis; for supplies for use in teaching the art of cooking to the Hospital Corps; for the supply of the Army and Navy Hospital at Hot Springs, Ark.; for advertising, laundry, and all other necessary miscellaneous expenses of the Medical Department, \$2,000,000.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order upon the paragraph, not because I object to the appropriation or the amount of money, but more particularly on account of the language contained in the lines beginning with the middle of line 18 and going down to the end of line 25, page 29, which apparently establishes a civilian corps attached to the Medical Department of the Army—

under such regulations fixing their number, assignment, pay, and allowances as shall have been or shall be prescribed by the Secretary of War, and disbursing officers of the Army shall be credited with all payments heretofore or to be hereafter made by them in accordance with such regulations.

I particularly call the attention of the Chair to the word "heretofore." The "disbursing officers of the Army shall be credited with all payments heretofore * * * made in accordance with such regulations." The effect of that is that the Secretary of War may make to-day regulations, and under the provisions of this bill the disbursing officer shall be credited the entire amount of expenditures which have not hitherto been authorized by law. For instance, if last fiscal year a disbursing officer made an expenditure entirely unauthorized by law, his accounts would be disallowed, would be a claim, perhaps a claim which ought to be allowed by Congress, and perhaps one which would not be allowed, but still a claim which would require legislation. Now, concealed in the midst of this language, in an appropriation bill—I do not mean any reflection—is absolutely the payment and settlement of a claim, nothing more or less than a claim. Now, it does not seem to me that that ought to be done in this way, and for that reason I am constrained to make the point of order.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, there is no question in my mind

but that the whole paragraph is subject to a point of order, but I want to say to the gentleman that there is one case where it may be necessary. There is a law on the statute book, and has been for forty or fifty years, that gives to the nurses of the Army 40 cents a day. Now, they could not get nurses at 40 cents a day, and the Surgeon-General contracted for them at \$40 a month during the Spanish war. They have been paid for, but the Comptroller of the Currency has been threatening to hold up all these accounts. They were civilian employees.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Let me suggest to the gentleman to bring in a specific provision for that, and I will raise no point of order against it. The difficulty is that under these things which ought to be done they insert general language and permit many things to be done which no one would approve of.

Mr. HULL. One other thing. Heretofore we have covered the medical supplies of two or three million dollars in two or three lines. Now, we have been more specific, but if the gentleman insists upon his point of order it all must go out.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman's point of order cover the whole paragraph, or only the lines indicated?

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. The lines indicated.

Mr. CANNON. I think it ought to be broader than that. I think it ought to cover the entire paragraph.

Mr. HULL. Then we shall have to put in other words.

Mr. CANNON. I will suggest, and in no captious spirit, that the whole paragraph ought to go out. One thing occurs to one member and another thing to another, and I have no doubt the gentleman had certain things in view which he wanted to correct; but as the gentleman from Massachusetts has said, in his attempt to cure one thing he is curing a good many things he had not in his mind. I am not at all sure but that this would utilize this appropriation for the treatment of officers and men on a furlough.

Mr. HULL. I think not. If it does, it is too broad.

Mr. CANNON. I think it would.

Mr. HULL. I want to say that the Military Committee put this in because it is in the estimate set out at great length, and the reasons for it were given at the hearing before the committee at considerable length by the Surgeon-General. We stated to him at the time that it was entirely subject to a point of order, but we would put it in, and if it met with the approval of the Committee of the Whole, all right, and if it did not we would make no contest.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois extends the point of order to the entire paragraph, and the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HULL. Now, Mr. Chairman, I want to move to amend, after the words "Medical and Hospital Department," by inserting the following: "For the purchase of medical and hospital supplies and all other necessary miscellaneous expenses in the Medical Department of the Army, \$2,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The chairman of the committee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the words "Medical and Hospital Department" insert "for the purchase of medical and hospital supplies and all other necessary miscellaneous expenses for the Medical Department of the Army, \$2,000,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the purchase of material for use of United States Engineer School and for instruction of engineer troops at Fort Totten, Willets Point, in their special duties as sappers and miners; for land and submarine mines, pontooners, torpedo drill, and signaling, and for travel expenses of officers on journeys approved by the Chief of Engineers and made for the purpose of instruction, \$1,500.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I would like a little explanation on this paragraph.

Mr. HULL. I suppose, Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Massachusetts refers to the words "for travel expenses of officers on journeys approved by the Chief of Engineers and made for the purpose of instruction?"

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. That is the one.

Mr. HULL. The mileage provision will not cover the expenses of engineer officers going to a city for the purpose of instruction. It has got to be approved by the Chief of Engineers, and it will be only his actual expenses. It waives the mileage and gives in place 7 cents a mile.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. He gets his mileage, travel to and from?

Mr. HULL. No; for instruction he gets actual expenses.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Under the existing law what would he get?

Mr. HULL. His mileage and nothing else.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. He gets his pay?

Mr. HULL. He gets his pay.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Why should he have any extra allowance?

Mr. HULL. We had this up at the last session.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I know, and it went out on a point of order.

Mr. HULL. My explanation is this: The engineer officers are compelled to go to such places, and they go there simply for instruction as to how to continue work, and they are kept there at work a week or longer. They have not established new quarters there; they are there temporarily, and the mileage for such a short distance does not pay them. A large number of engineers performing this duty at different points are of low rank, small pay—lieutenants and captains—and the result of it is that you keep them impoverished if you do not pay their expenses when they are sent from one place to another for instruction. When they are stationed at any place they do not get this allowance; there is no change of law in that respect. This provision applies only when they are sent upon temporary duty for purposes of instruction. It does seem to me that this is a very fair and a very mild proposition.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I shall not move to strike out this provision, against the wish of the gentleman from Iowa; but I desire to point out to him that he is making a very dangerous precedent, which will come home to trouble him hereafter. These officers are already allowed mileage and commutation of quarters; and now we establish a precedent for allowing a third kind of contribution to the officers' support. It will be very easy to come in next year with another class of officers for whom the same thing can be said.

Mr. HULL. In regard to an officer going from one station to another, to which he has been assigned, this provision does not apply. It simply allows actual expenses where an officer is sent to certain places for purposes of instruction.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Officers traveling without troops would get their mileage.

Mr. HULL. Their expenses only.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. If they are traveling under orders without troops, why are they not entitled to mileage in addition to expenses?

Mr. HULL. I do not believe they would get both. I think under this provision they will get only their actual expenses.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. Would the gentleman agree to an amendment to insert after the word "expenses" the words "in lieu of all mileage or other allowances?"

Mr. HULL. I have no objection to that.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I move, then, to amend at the end of the paragraph by adding—

Provided, That in such case there shall be no mileage or other allowances paid.

Mr. HULL. I suggest that the gentleman's object would be better accomplished by an amendment of this kind, to come in after the word "instruction," line 12, page 31:

Provided, That the traveling expenses herein provided for shall be in lieu of all mileage or other allowances.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I have no objection to that phraseology. I so modify my amendment.

The amendment of Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts as modified was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For infantry, cavalry, and artillery equipments, including horse equipments for cavalry and artillery, including machinery, tools, and fixtures for their manufacture at the arsenals, \$750,000.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I make a point of order. I submit that in the paragraph just read the words "including machinery, tools, and fixtures for their manufacture at the arsenals" are not in order. I think there can be no question that this point is well taken. It has been passed upon already after very elaborate argument; and I think the gentleman from Iowa will agree that the point of order must be sustained.

Mr. HULL. I agree that the Chairman of the Committee of the Whole on the state of the Union has heretofore almost invariably been mistaken on points of order of this class, and has ruled wrongly. I do not concede that the provision is subject to a point of order, though I have no doubt such will be the ruling. I simply stand up to get knocked down. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For firing the morning and evening gun at military posts prescribed by General Orders, No. 70, Headquarters of the Army, dated July 23, 1867, and at National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and its several branches, including National Soldiers' Home in Washington, D. C., and at Soldiers and Sailors' State Homes, including material for cartridge bags, reworking obsolete powder, etc., \$25,000.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I notice in the paragraph just read reference is made to "the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers and its several branches." This brings to my mind a statement which I have frequently seen in the press of late that these Homes are closed to veterans of the

Spanish-American war. I have understood that some provision was to be made for these veterans in the sundry civil bill.

Before this bill is passed, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs or the gentleman from Massachusetts, who is a member of the Appropriations Committee, whether any provision has been inserted in the sundry civil bill (which I believe has already been reported to the House) providing that Spanish-American war veterans shall be given in these Homes the same privileges accorded to veterans of the civil war and the Mexican war? If this is not the case, I will introduce an amendment to the pending bill covering this matter.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. That subject received the attention of the subcommittee of the Committee on Appropriations, having charge of the sundry civil bill, and a provision was drawn, which was submitted to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] and to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE], who, as the gentleman knows, is one of the governors of the Soldiers' Homes of the country. This provision declares in terms which can no longer be open to dispute that all persons serving in either the Army or the Navy of the United States in any war which may have been had heretofore or which may hereafter be had shall be eligible for admission to the Soldiers' Homes.

I can make the statement even broader than that. The provision is that any man serving in the Army or Navy, now or hereafter, shall be entitled to admission to the Soldiers' Home, provided he received permission to do so from the Board of Managers of that Home. I think that answers the gentleman's question.

Of course, that provision will be subject to a point of order; but after the care that has been taken with it in submitting it to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HULL] and the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. STEELE], the committee anticipate that it will receive the unanimous assent of the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. It is a paragraph in the sundry civil bill.

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. HULL. I desire to go back to lines 11 and 12 on page 33. The point of order raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts was only after the word "artillery," in line 12, as I understand it.

The CHAIRMAN. That was what was ruled upon.

Mr. HULL. Simply striking out the words—

Including machinery, tools, and fixtures for their manufacture at the arsenals.

The CHAIRMAN. That was stricken out.

Mr. HULL. Some gentlemen around me seemed to think that the whole paragraph was stricken out.

The CHAIRMAN. No; only the portion indicated by the gentleman.

The Clerk resumed, and completed the reading of the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I should like to go back to page 23, in accordance with the vote of the House, and to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. In accordance with the permission given by the committee, the committee will return to the paragraph beginning with line 15, page 23.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I offer the amendment which is at the Clerk's desk, to come in at line 5 on page 23, after the word "soldiers."

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert, after the word "soldiers," in line 5, page 23, the words:

Provided, That if the amount expended by the Government for the burial of any enlisted man or officer shall exceed the sum now allowed by law, then in each case a sum not exceeding \$35 in the case of each enlisted man and \$75 in the case of each officer shall be paid to the family or legal representative of the deceased for the expenses of burial incurred by the family or the legal representative of such deceased person.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, reserving the point of order, I should like to say to the gentleman that in each case he ought to insert the words "not exceeding."

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. It does say so.

Mr. HULL. I thought it simply said so much.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. No; it says that he shall receive "not exceeding."

Mr. HULL. Very well.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. If the words "not exceeding" are not there I desire to insert those words.

The CHAIRMAN. The words "not exceeding" appear before the word "thirty-five," but not before the word "seventy-five."

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I desire to insert the words "not exceeding" before the word "seventy-five."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will insert the words "not exceeding" before the word "seventy-five." The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HULL. Mr. Chairman, I move that when the committee rise it report the bill to the House with a favorable recommendation.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa moves that when the committee rise it report the bill H. R. 14017 with amendments to the House with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

SUNDY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I call up the sundry civil appropriation bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois calls up an appropriation bill the title of which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 14018) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Chairman, I ask to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANNON. I will ask the gentleman from Arkansas [Mr. McRAE] to give me his attention. I am desirous to get at the consideration of the bill as early as possible under the five-minute rule. So far as I am concerned, I do not desire at this time to occupy any time of the committee. Can we agree about the time for general debate?

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I have had some applications for time on this side and gentlemen desire to use that time in general debate. I will be perfectly frank with the gentleman, and say that those who have applied to me do not desire to confine their remarks to the bill, but do desire to consume some considerable time.

Mr. CANNON. I will say to my friend, as the discussion is not to be upon the bill, it is important, as my friend knows, that this bill should go to the Senate, and I trust—

Mr. McRAE. I think the bill already passed will furnish enough business for the other body for some time.

Mr. CANNON. Ah, but a different committee has that. The bills have to be considered by the various committees, and here is an important bill, and we are within a short time of the expiration of this Congress. It takes some time for any committee to consider this bill, either in the House or in the Senate. Now, I want to suggest to my friend that it does seem to me that the House had better arrange for debate, not upon a bill like this, but after the bill is passed.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I should be very glad to accommodate the gentleman, and I am quite as anxious as he is to get this bill through the House, and yet he must admit that so far as this side of the House is concerned, during this session we have not taken up very much of the time of the Committee of the Whole in discussion, and it is nothing but right and fair that gentlemen who now have remarks to submit should have an opportunity to do so.

Mr. CANNON. How much time does the gentleman desire?

Mr. McRAE. I have had applications from three gentlemen who each want an hour. I do not know of any others, and I think that it is not unreasonable to ask three hours on a side.

Mr. CANNON. Well, then, Mr. Chairman, I will ask—

Mr. McRAE. I think the gentleman will save time by permitting these speeches to be made, and then—

Mr. CANNON. I will ask unanimous consent that after this bill is completed three hours be granted for general debate, to address the House generally.

Mr. McRAE. Three hours on a side?

Mr. CANNON. Three on a side—two on a side.

Mr. McRAE. Oh, no.

Mr. CANNON. Then three hours on a side.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that the reading of the bill be proceeded with for discussion under the five-minute rule, and that at its conclusion there be six hours' general debate.

Mr. CANNON. After the bill is passed?

Mr. McRAE. No; at the conclusion of the bill.

Mr. CANNON. But in the meantime I want the bill passed. The gentleman has been perfectly candid and has said that the debate is not to be upon the bill.

Mr. McRAE. I perhaps did not make myself understood if I said that all the gentlemen who wanted to discuss it did not desire to discuss the bill, because one member of the committee says that he does desire to discuss the bill. Two have frankly stated to me that they desired to direct their remarks, at least in part, to matters not in the bill.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I want to say to the gentleman from Arkansas that I desire to address myself under general debate to the provisions of the bill on the subject of the insane hospital, and I shall want thirty minutes in which to do that.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I had supposed, Mr. Chairman, that the discussion on the bill would come under the paragraph debate.

How much time does the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. BELL] want?

Mr. BELL. I want an hour, but I think I may get through in half an hour.

Mr. McRAE. And the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. RICHARDSON] wants an hour, and the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] wants an hour.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I can not consent to six hours' general debate on this bill. I will take my chances first.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I will state frankly that I do not expect to take an hour, but I want time to discuss some of the features of this bill.

Mr. CANNON. Why, certainly; the greatest possible time—

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. What was the gentleman's remark?

Mr. CANNON. I say the greatest possible time that is asked in good faith on the bill I have no doubt will be granted.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I shall discuss only the items of this bill.

Mr. CANNON. Can it not be done under the five-minute rule, I will say to my friend?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I could not do it in five minutes.

Mr. CANNON. But my friend understands that there is always time given when the discussion is in good faith.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Well, I do not understand it that way. In the last few days I have seen a pretty rigid enforcement of the five-minute rule.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, it is not fair, when gentlemen desire to exercise their right of general debate, to ask them to put themselves at the mercy of the chairman of the committee, or of gentlemen who may make points of order against them under the five-minute rule.

Now, it has been the practice here of allowing some latitude. I want to say that we have not been unreasonable in the consideration of some of these bills. The fortification bill was passed without any debate. So far as I am concerned, I do not want to discuss this; but I think I am not unreasonable when I ask the gentleman from Illinois to allow these gentlemen the time they desire, to say what they have a desire to say.

Mr. CANNON. We can have an evening session this evening. Well, I will ask unanimous consent that debate be concluded in four hours, two on a side, and that we have an evening session, beginning at 8 o'clock this evening.

Mr. McRAE. Mr. Chairman, I shall have to object to that, because I do not stay out at night when I can avoid it. My physician tells me not to do so; and I want to be here when we consider this bill. We have plenty of time to pass all the bills in the daytime.

Mr. CANNON. Well, Mr. Chairman, it seems that we can come to no conclusion about that matter. I suppose we shall have to let debate proceed. I will reserve the remainder of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Is the gentleman going to give no explanation in reference to any of the items of this bill?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, the report covers the bill; but I will answer any questions gentlemen desire to ask if I can.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That is what I want.

Mr. CANNON. Does my friend want to ask a question?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. There is a proposition in this bill providing for the purchase of 140 acres of land—

Mr. CANNON. One hundred and forty-five.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana (continuing). One hundred and forty-five acres of land, upon which to erect buildings for the accommodation of the insane?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. And I understand it is the same land that was up in a proposition a year ago.

Mr. CANNON. In part.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I would like to ask the gentleman, upon that proposition, whether it is an asylum that provides for the insane of the Army and Navy?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I understand, however, that they have inmates, probably 2,100, there, and of that number 1,100 provided for come from the District of Columbia.

Mr. CANNON. The gentleman in part is correct. I will not say exactly what the number is, but the gentleman is practically correct.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. And the District of Columbia pays its share for the maintenance of the District of Columbia insane?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Does the District of Columbia, however, pay anything for the purchase of the land upon which to erect this asylum, or anything for the erection of the buildings to provide for the insane of the District of Columbia?

Mr. CANNON. The bill does not so provide, as I recollect.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Then this is an appropriation for the building for the asylum which has heretofore been appropriated for, \$975,000, and the contemplated appropriation of nearly \$200,000 for the purchase of land comes from the United States Treasury and no part of it from the District of Columbia?

Mr. CANNON. My recollection as to this bill is the money for the purchase of the land and the extension of the asylum is payable from the Treasury alone. I do not recollect as to all former appropriations, whether they were in part payable from the District revenues or not.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Does the gentleman think, if we allow this appropriation for land or for the erection of buildings, it should come properly from the Treasury of the United States, or should not a portion of it come from the funds of the District of Columbia, which has more than 53 per cent of the inmates of the asylum?

Mr. CANNON. In my judgment, as this is an asylum principally for the accommodation of members of the Army and the Navy who may become insane, as well as for the soldiers and sailors of the civil war, it seems to me that perhaps it is well enough that we go on and make the construction now. My recollection is—in late years, at least—we have constructed from the Treasury of the United States. However, if my friend should be of a different opinion, when we reach that clause in the bill it is subject to amendment.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Well, passing to another proposition. As I understand it, the cost to the United States for transporting soldiers from San Francisco to this asylum is something like \$70, not counting the cost of the guard accompanying. I also understand that it takes an average of four months to effect a cure of patients. I likewise understand the per capita cost to the United States Government for the cure of these people is \$220. Now, that being so, would it not be better to establish an asylum or make an arrangement for the care of insane soldiers in California.

Mr. CANNON. That is a matter that has been discussed to a greater or less extent; and if the gentleman has any proposition to submit upon that point, and after the legislation has been had authorizing it, no doubt it would receive the consideration of the Committee of the Whole House. I will say to the gentleman, however, in that connection, that whether there should be an insane asylum to care for Government patients—when I speak of Government I mean United States patients—at some points other than the District of Columbia, whether it be California or not, it is patent to anybody who will examine this insane asylum that for the people that are now there that this addition, from every standpoint, ought to be made.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. That new buildings should be erected?

Mr. CANNON. New buildings should be erected and the old buildings bettered.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I will suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that the Senator from Maine has introduced a bill that received favorable consideration of the committee in the Senate providing that some provisions would be made by the asylum authorities of California for the treatment of the insane on the Western coast who come from the Philippine Islands, and that Secretary Long has recommended that as being advisable and more economical than bringing them across the country to the asylum at Washington.

Mr. CANNON. That may be true; I am not advised as to whether it is true or not; but if it be true, it is a matter for legislation by Congress.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I would like to ask if the Secretary of the Interior has indorsed the purchase of this land?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I notice in the Senate proceedings of May 29 of last year a letter of the Secretary of the Interior, written in January, in which he said he had not sanctioned the purchase of additional land, and that relating back to the time it was read in the Senate without dispute, would seem to indicate that the Secretary of the Interior on May 29 was not in favor of the purchase of additional land. If that be true, I would like to know what new condition has arisen that might have changed the mind of the Secretary or of the legislators.

Mr. CANNON. I will say that the Secretary of the Interior, as I recollect, did recommend the purchase of the proposed land, or most of it, at the last session of Congress, and submitted it in the regular estimates. In addition to that he has again and again recommended and urged that an appropriation be made to purchase this land.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. On the 29th of May in the Senate was read a letter from E. A. Hitchcock, Secretary of the Interior, in which these words were used:

In response thereto, I have to state that the purchase of the land in question for the purpose of a hospital for the insane has not been recommended by the Secretary of the Interior. The statement in relation to this property which appears in the Book of Estimates for appropriations for the ensuing fiscal year was printed therein through inadvertence.

Now, is there any statement contrary to that that the gentleman knows of in writing?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, time and again, as I recollect, the Secretary of the Interior has recommended, in writing, this purchase, and several times has recommended it and urged it strongly in person.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman and the committee are well aware that the law existing to-day was passed at the last session of Congress. This provision of the bill on page 74, "the buildings herein provided for may be erected on land now owned or that may be acquired by the United States for a Government hospital for the insane"—I will ask him if he does not think it subject to a point of order as changing existing law?

Mr. CANNON. My judgment is that it is not; but it is within the province of the gentleman to test it by making a point of order if he wants to when the time arises.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. And the next provision, which is the general one—I presume the gentleman would make the same assertion in reference to a point of order?

Mr. CANNON. I think I should.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. In view of the fact that we provided two years ago that the asylum should be erected on land owned by the Government, does not the gentleman think this provision is subject to a point of order?

Mr. CANNON. I will discuss the point of order when it is reached. If it be subject to a point of order, and is so held by the Chairman and so held by the committee, then it would undoubtedly go out. I do not have to instruct the gentleman from Indiana upon that point.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I feel that I am trespassing on the gentleman's time, but I have only a question or two more. The land now owned by the Government on the side of the street where the present asylum is located contains 189 acres, approximately?

Mr. CANNON. I will see in a moment. I can not carry these things in my recollection, but it is about that.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The buildings all around there occupy something like 6 acres of land, and a contour line drawn around would surround about twice that, or 12 acres.

Mr. CANNON. I do not know the amount of land that the buildings and stables occupy.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Does the gentleman say that there is not sufficient land on which to erect the building on the site already owned by the Government, on the side of the road where the parent institution is?

Mr. CANNON. In my judgment there is not sufficient land for the extension of the building.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. There are 40 or 50 acres of flat, level land, are there not?

Mr. CANNON. Possibly so; but in my judgment the buildings are already too greatly crowded and there is not sufficient ground for a suitable location for the other buildings. If the gentleman would have these buildings constructed compactly, as we erect buildings on blocks in a city, there is no doubt ample room; but if we are to have a wise, judicious construction of the buildings of that insane asylum, then, so far as my judgment goes, there is not room within the space indicated by the gentleman.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Why would the gentleman object to erecting those building upon the 174 acres of land immediately across the road?

Mr. CANNON. Before I examined the question, before I had seen the land, I was of the opinion that the buildings should properly go on the other side of the road. But after seeing the land and after hearing the statements of gentlemen much better versed than I am touching the proper construction of accommodations for the insane, their opinions seemed to be unanimous that the opposite side of the road was not a proper place for the construction of additional buildings—first, because there is no shade there; second, because it is not practicable to heat the buildings on both sides with a common heating plant; third, because of the greater cost of sewerage; fourth, because of the greater cost of the transportation of fuel; fifthly, (and this is the last consideration to which I shall refer now), experts are of opinion that the land on the other side of the road is required for a farm in connection with the institution and in connection with the treatment of the insane.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. But does not the gentleman know that with the congested condition over there, there being 400 or 500 more inmates than can be properly housed, that farm—probably 50 or 60 acres of it—has been used for the purpose of planting or raising grass and hay?

Mr. CANNON. And for the employment of the patients.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. But that employment would certainly not contribute to the welfare, or health, or cure of the inmates of the insane asylum, because the land in hay does not require to be planted, or reaped, or worked but a couple of days in a year.

Mr. CANNON. As there is something to do on a farm at other

times than two days in the year devoted to cutting the grass, possibly there would be other employments.

Perhaps it may be that the gentleman has given this matter close attention, and is an expert on questions of this sort, so that he can say that the opinions of experts are of not sufficient value against his opinion.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. But the gentleman gave such a splendid description the other day of what a "specialist" is I desired to remind him of that definition, and remind him that frequently experts become specialists.

Mr. CANNON. I do not know to what the gentleman refers, but I will ask him if he has been over to that institution and examined that proposed site?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I have.

Mr. CANNON. How much time did the gentleman spend there?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Four hours.

Mr. CANNON. How lately?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Within ten days.

Mr. CANNON. Did any of the gentlemen who are familiar with the proposed site and with the wants of the institution accompany the gentleman from Indiana?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I was around those localities proposed for the erection of buildings on land now owned by the Government, and generally over the various tracts.

Mr. CANNON. Was the gentleman accompanied by Dr. Richardson or by any of the board of visitors, or did he go "on his own hook?"

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I was not with Dr. Richardson, because I do not know him; and he did not call upon me to go with him.

Mr. CANNON. Whom was the gentleman with?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I went over there with Dr. Emmons, who represents the Citizens' Association of Congress Heights. But I will say that, so far as I am concerned, I have no interests in common with that association. My examination had reference purely to the question of a judicious expenditure of the money of the Government.

Mr. CANNON. Dr. Emmons is against this purchase?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. He is, as a good many members on this floor are, and as are a good many Senators.

Mr. CANNON. Very likely. I am delighted to know that the gentleman has gone over the land and viewed it and has heard that side of the question. There may be many members of the House who are against this proposition. They are entitled, of course, to their own judgment. If any man on this floor can say that in his judgment the better way is not to purchase this land, I certainly have no objection to his taking that position.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. The report of the board of visitors shows that we have already the power to erect buildings to the extent of \$975,000 upon the land now owned by the Government.

Mr. CANNON. Undoubtedly.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman from Illinois allow me a question?

Mr. CANNON. One word more to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON] and then I will yield to my friend from New York.

Let me read from the annual report of the Secretary of the Interior. My friend from Indiana has been so constant in reading the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, especially the Senate proceedings, that probably the report of this Department, if not some other matters, may have escaped his attention. I read from page 143.

I concur in the conclusion of the board as to the necessity for additional land for the use of the hospital, and recommend that Congress, by appropriate legislation, make adequate provision therefor. But failing prompt action in that direction, the crowded condition of the institution will necessitate the construction of a portion of the new buildings on the farm land of the institution east of Nichols avenue.

I now yield to my friend from New York.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to ask about the fall in the price of this land. It appears that in 1900 there was reported in the Senate an appropriation of \$245,000 for 105 acres of this land, being at the rate of about \$2,500 an acre. And then the House committee, in reporting the sundry civil bill for the current year, proposed the purchase of 140 acres at \$210,000, which would be about \$1,500 an acre. Now the proposition is to pay \$145,000 for 145 acres, or \$1,000 an acre. Did not the committee report a year ago, or at the time the proposition was up, to pay \$1,500 an acre, on the ground that experts had valued this land at \$1,900 an acre?

Mr. CANNON. I think I had better answer the gentleman's question by making a statement. Gentlemen, some of them, have visited this asylum and know the necessities of further improvements at that point. Some two or three years ago, when there was a necessity for improvement, an amendment was placed upon the sundry civil bill in the Senate. The transaction is set out in the report of the committee. I will ask that it be read at the Clerk's desk, commencing at page 3, "Government Hospital for the Insane."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

GOVERNMENT HOSPITAL FOR THE INSANE.

The committee recommend in the accompanying bill the purchase of land adjoining the present site of the Government Hospital for the Insane. The paragraph is on page 74 of the bill, and is as follows:

"For the purchase, at the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior, of not less than 145 acres of land immediately adjoining the present building site of the hospital on the south and extending from Nichols avenue to the Anacostia River, to be acquired by condemnation or otherwise, a sum not to exceed \$145,000, to be immediately available."

In view of the fact that the proposition for the purchase of this land was debated in the House at the last session of Congress and defeated, the committee deem it due to the House to explain fully the reasons which have led them to recommend the appropriation in the present bill. The present hospital buildings are located upon land belonging to the Government, lying between Nichols avenue and the Anacostia River. The Government also owns land on the other side of Nichols avenue, which it uses as a farm tributary to the hospital. The land which it is proposed to purchase adjoins the Government land upon which the hospital buildings stand.

The proposition to purchase the land in question appeared first in the form of a Senate amendment to the sundry civil bill for the fiscal year 1900, where it was proposed to purchase 105 acres for \$245,000. This amendment was disagreed to without discussion by the House and went out of the bill in conference. In the sundry civil bill for the current year the committee recommended an appropriation of \$210,000 for the purchase of 140 acres of land adjoining the hospital buildings. After debate in the House the provision was stricken out. A large expenditure, however, was authorized for the construction of much-needed hospital buildings, which were required to be constructed upon lands already owned by the Government or upon suitable lands as might be donated to the Government within the District of Columbia for that purpose. The plans for the buildings are now completed and the work of construction can soon begin. But as no land has been donated to the Government for the purpose, the buildings must, unless Congress should otherwise determine, be constructed upon the farm lands attached to the hospital, upon the other side of Nichols avenue.

It is the opinion of the superintendent of the hospital that for many reasons it is inexpedient to construct the new buildings upon the farm lands, and he has urged upon the committee the considerations that the difficulty and expense of administration would be much increased, that the lands are not adapted for hospital purposes, and that a farm is absolutely necessary for the employment of inmates in the interest of their health and successful treatment. The Secretary of the Interior with great earnestness supports the views of the superintendent.

Therefore the committee recommend and report this appropriation to the House for its action. It will be observed that by the Senate amendment to the sundry civil bill for 1900 the price proposed was \$2,333 per acre. An appraisal of the land was made for the committee at the last session of Congress, which fixed the value at \$1,900 per acre. The recommendation of the committee at the last session, which was rejected by the House, fixed the price at \$1,500 per acre. The committee's present recommendation fixes the maximum price at \$1,000 per acre. Although the land has been taxed at a much less figure, the committee after investigation believe that it has cost the owners somewhere between \$600 and \$800 per acre, including the interest on the purchase money.

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I believe that gives the history of this land so far as Congress has had to do with it, in the effort to purchase it for the purpose of building an extension of the insane asylum upon it.

Mr. PAYNE. I understand that the owners of this property have laid out streets and spent considerable money in grading streets on these premises. Is that correct?

Mr. CANNON. I think not. I understand that there has been a plat made, but I think not much money spent in grading streets.

Mr. PAYNE. Was not that a large portion of the cost?

Mr. CANNON. And the plat has been abrogated.

Mr. PAYNE. Was not a large portion of the cost of the land to the present owners, as shown in the evidence before your committee, the expense of grading up and laying out streets?

Mr. CANNON. Oh, no; not by any manner of means.

Mr. PAYNE. I have been told so by a member of the committee.

Mr. CANNON. Well, I do not so understand it; and if it is so, I was not shown that part of the land when I went over there.

Mr. PAYNE. Now, has not the real-estate speculation, so far as the sale of lots is concerned, proved a failure, so that these gentlemen have this land upon their hands with unsalable lots?

Mr. CANNON. I can not answer that question, whether it has proved a failure or not.

Mr. PAYNE. It is a fact, is it not, that none of it has been sold as city lots?

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. I can answer that question.

Mr. CANNON. That none of these 145 acres have been sold as city lots—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will say that if gentlemen desire to interrupt, they must first address the Chair.

Mr. CANNON. I believe I am competent to answer the question that my friend asks me. If not, I will ask my friend from Indiana to come to my aid.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to ask my friend if it is not a fact that this land is assessed and has been assessed for several years at about \$80 an acre?

Mr. CANNON. I understand it has been assessed at a very small amount. I am not sure about the amount.

Mr. PAYNE. About \$80 an acre. Now, from those facts, is not the House warranted in coming to the conclusion that the Government is asked to take this real estate speculation, which has proved a failure, off the hands of these gentlemen at a profit amounting to the difference between six or seven or eight hundred

dollars an acre and a thousand dollars an acre by this appropriation?

Mr. CANNON. In reply to that I will ask my friend if he has been over and examined this land?

Mr. PAYNE. I have not.

Mr. CANNON. As this is a pretty important matter, will my friend go and look over that ground himself?

Mr. PAYNE. Well, I am afraid that if I went over there I would not then know anything about the value of the land, because I am not an expert in that kind of business.

Mr. WM. ALDEN SMITH. But you would not decline the gentleman's invitation?

Mr. PAYNE. But it would give me great pleasure to take a ride with the gentleman from Illinois on any day, on any occasion, upon any errand.

Mr. CANNON. I have already seen the premises, and I wish the gentleman would go and see them for himself rather than, perchance, take the suggestion of somebody who may have an interest either in holding up the owners of this land, asking a bonus to keep his hands off on the one hand, or upon somebody who may have an interest in real estate on the other side of the road or this side of the road, who may want to shift it back and forth to get rid of the location of the hospital.

Now, let me say further, the House recollects its action at the last session of Congress upon this question. It was had under the leadership of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY], in whom the House had great confidence. It followed his leadership in that matter. When the matter came up again for investigation before the Committee on Appropriations, as chairman of the subcommittee, having my own opinion about this matter as to the necessity of the purchase of this land for the erection of these additions to the insane hospital, I referred this whole matter to the gentleman from Massachusetts, saying to him and to the subcommittee, so far as I was concerned, that he should bind or loose our recommendation by the result of his investigation.

Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] entered upon that investigation. It is a long story. He can tell it himself in his own way. At the end of his investigation he reported to the subcommittee that in his judgment under existing conditions that land ought to be bought to build this addition to the Insane Asylum upon it, and that, while possibly it might be bought for less than a thousand dollars, in his judgment, from the best inquiry he could make, it had cost from six to eight hundred dollars an acre. Now, the subcommittee took the conclusions of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY], reported to the full committee, and the full committee almost unanimously directed the report to be made to the House, and there you are.

If this asylum is to be constructed upon this 145 acres of land, the plans are now ready. It is authorized by law. They are ready to let the contracts. If this land is not bought and the addition is not constructed upon the 145 acres, then under the provisions of the law it must be constructed upon the land on the other side of Nichols avenue. So far as I am concerned, I have no doubt but that the necessities of the Government from every standpoint are along the line of the purchase of this 145 acres of land. I have no pride of opinion about it. I think it is not necessary for me to assure this House that I have no interest personally or by way of real estate speculation in adjacent property.

If it is necessary, I will so state it. And now that the matter is presented, scrutinized closely and properly, and to the advantage of the Government, as it has been heretofore, because this land from the time it was first proposed to be bought at \$2,800 an acre by the Senate amendment, has been appraised by two of the most creditable real estate men that I have knowledge of in the District of Columbia at \$1,900 an acre; then the purchase was reported at \$1,500, and now it is reported at \$1,000. In my judgment, that is a fair price for the land. Having made the report and performed my duty, I have no more care as to whether the appropriation is made for the purchase of this land than any other member of this House of Representatives who will give the matter his consideration and be informed upon it for himself.

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. Will the gentleman allow me to ask him one question?

Mr. CANNON. One further word. I am greatly gratified at the keenness with which members of the House scrutinize the purchase of this land. I did wonder the other day, in fact my eye sought the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ROBINSON], when the naval bill was being considered and the purchase of a whole island down here in the Potomac was authorized, as alleged, for a proving ground. How many acres God knows; I do not. At what price God knows. There is no limit placed upon it. I looked and I almost wept, and sweat great drops of agony that my good friend from Indiana was not there, you know, like a watchman upon the tower, to ask questions about that purchase. Of course, that does not affect this matter.

Now, once for all, I want to say again that I have performed my duty toward the House, touching the erection of this insane

asylum. I trust that I shall perform my duty toward myself well enough so that in the few years of my life which I have left I will not get into it. [Laughter.] And having performed that duty, I am quite willing that my friend from New York [Mr. PAYNE] shall go over and look at it, and inform himself by questioning me or the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY], or otherwise, in the performance of his duty, because the question is up to him, as well as to other members of the House.

Mr. PAYNE. I want to make a suggestion, if the gentleman will allow me?

Mr. CANNON. Certainly.

Mr. ROBINSON of Indiana. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. NORTON of Ohio rose.

Mr. CANNON. I will say to my friend from Ohio that I will yield to him a little later, and also to the gentleman from Indiana.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that gentlemen who desire to interrupt must first address the Chair.

Mr. PAYNE. My attention was first called to this matter when the Senate amendment came over here proposing to pay about \$2,400 per acre for this land. My attention was called to it by a member of the Appropriations Committee. I got my information from him, and opposed the provision, I think, on the floor of the House. There was more or less discussion, and many facts came out about it at that time. The result was, if I remember, that at that time the amendment went out. Whether there was discussion in the House or not, I had that information from a member of the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will permit me, the first time the proposition was made it went out in conference and not by any action of the House.

Mr. PAYNE. Well, at least the proposition was called to my attention then by a member of the Committee on Appropriations, and these facts were stated.

On the next occasion I was here when the fight was made upon it. I listened to the debate. I got my information largely from the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] and from other members of the House who discussed it here upon the floor of the House. Now, I have heard no reason and have had no reason since to doubt the facts that came out in that debate. My questions to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations to-day seem to confirm those facts. In view of those facts as they came out in the last debate, the House determined not to pay \$1,500 an acre for this land, but in their wisdom they said there was room enough on the land already owned by the Government on which to place these buildings. They put it into the law that these buildings should be erected on the land owned by the Government, and they put in a large enough limit of appropriation to pay for the buildings.

This was to be done unless some one should donate suitable lands to the Government, which, of course, has not been done. Now it comes in here with a further reduction. Whatever action the House has had, they have reduced the price from \$2,230 down to \$1,000 an acre. Well, the gentleman says that these different experts said that it was worth \$1,900 an acre—experts of high reputation, experts in the business, etc. Yet the committee had so much lack of confidence in these experts that they reported the bill at \$1,500 an acre; and their confidence in the experts seems to be diminishing. They now report it at \$1,000, while other experts, to wit, the assessors of the District, assess it for \$80 or \$85 an acre. Now, it seems to me, we ought to keep up this thing until we get it down to somewhere near the actual value of this real estate.

Mr. CANNON. What is the actual value of it?

Mr. PAYNE. I do not know. It is impossible to find out the actual value.

Mr. CANNON. Can the gentleman say \$1,000 is not the actual value?

Mr. PAYNE. I heard it stated that it was not worth \$500 by gentlemen who claim to know. I think the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MOODY] was of the opinion at that time, with other gentlemen.

Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts. I so stated.

Mr. PAYNE. I thought that was his opinion at that time, and I have great confidence in his judgment. Now they come in with a report here that it has cost \$600 to \$800 an acre. It is not necessarily the value. I do not say that here, Mr. Chairman, at all; and if it be correct, and I am correct, if the information I had that part of this cost was laying out this land, and grading it into streets, etc., there is no reason why the Government should pay for that. If gentlemen have made a losing speculation, if they paid more for this land than it is worth, it is no reason why the Government should go in and make it a good speculation for them. My inquiries have been in the direction of finding out the facts, that the House may be possessed of them and know whether they should pay \$1,000 for this real estate. I did not think of asking any such question as that, and I do not want gentlemen to think that there is any imputation upon gentlemen, members of the Committee on Appropriations. I could not be made to believe

that any member of this committee was interested wrongfully in any appropriation that comes before the House of Representatives.

Mr. CANNON. Well, now, in reply to the gentleman, when that committee has performed its functions according to its best judgment it is but the servant of the House, and all I ask the gentleman is that he will take one-tenth part of the time that this committee has taken and investigate this matter.

Mr. PAYNE. I am not charged with that investigation.

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Chairman, I doubt whether the gentleman does justice to himself in refusing to take that time to investigate, and still saying, without taking the time, "I will say that this is an unwise proposition;" because if the gentleman is mistaken and refuses to take the time, the people who are interested in this improvement—the unfortunate people imprisoned within the walls, the unfortunate people confined to the farm and to these inclosures—have nobody to speak for them. Now, it will not take but one morning, not to exceed two or three hours at the outside, for the gentleman to go out to St. Elizabeth's, and I will see to it, if he will allow me, that a way of getting him out there is afforded. [Laughter.]

Mr. PAYNE. I thank the gentleman for the offer.

Mr. CANNON. And I will see to it, because I have that much interest in it, and because Dr. Richardson, who is in charge of this asylum—an expert, I believe, who has no superior in the United States, from his reputation—has very well defined views about it; and I am quite sure that if my friend there and other members of the House would allow the doctor to show them these grounds and point out the existing conditions, being in charge, that they would be either confirmed in their opposition or they would say that they had knowledge of their own and appropriate for this land or refuse the appropriation.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman allow me a moment? The gentleman's offer is so kind that if I had the time I should be very glad to avail myself of it, although I might provide the conveyance for myself, or walking is good. The difficulty is this: The gentleman's committee has charge of certain matters to investigate and report to the House. Now, the gentleman's committee is charged with this matter. Other committees to which I belong have other duties, and I have not the time. I can not go out there and investigate; and, if I had, I would not be able to state, by inspecting these lands, whether they were worth \$500, or \$1,000, or what they were worth. I trust to the action of the House, and the circumstances that followed satisfied me that the lands are not worth \$500 an acre, as put by the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Now, if this appropriation for this land fails, it does not stop the erection of these buildings. They go upon land already owned by the Government of the United States; and a great many members of the House believe that there is ample room on the lands already owned by the people for this new building of a Government hospital for the insane. They may be mistaken in that; that is a matter for the gentleman and his committee to show to the House; but these gentlemen who are in prison, as the gentleman says, who are insane, who are the objects of our sympathy, will still have these buildings erected; nay, they might possibly be in process of erection now except some one has seen fit to delay for the purpose of buying this additional land.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. MOODY of Massachusetts having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CUNNINGHAM, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 6240) for the preparation of plans or designs for a memorial or statue of Gen. Ulysses S. Grant, on ground belonging to the United States Government in the city of Washington, D. C.; in which the concurrence of the House was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following order:

Ordered, That at ten minutes before 1 o'clock on Wednesday, February 13, 1901, the Senate proceed to the Hall of the House of Representatives to take part in the count of the electoral votes for President and Vice-President of the United States.

SUNDRY CIVIL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. CANNON. Now, Mr. Chairman, one word in reply. The gentleman says the buildings might now be in process of erection if it had not been, perchance, they had been delayed with an ulterior object. I have said before that the plans for these buildings had to be made and approved. They have been made and have just been completed; and it is reported to us that they have been approved by the board of visitors and the Secretary of the Interior and Dr. Richardson. Now, there has been no time lost up to this time. So I would prefer to believe the Secretary, Dr. Richardson, and the board of visitors as to whether the buildings had been delayed or not, rather than to draw on my imagination and impute some evil design to those gentlemen.

Now, the eminent gentleman from New York says that he has no time to go out 3 miles and devote two hours to an examination

of these buildings or this site. I apprehend that is true. He says he must rely on the Committee on Appropriations, which is charged with this duty of advising the House. The Committee on Appropriations has advised the House in this report and in this bill, and the gentleman refuses to take two or three hours' time, and prefers to disregard the advice of that committee and go upon his own impression without looking at the site. That is his privilege.

Mr. PAYNE. Will the gentleman allow an interruption there?

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. PAYNE. What I rely on the Committee on Appropriations for is a report of the facts. Of course, I must exercise my own judgment, with all due deference to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. CANNON. Certainly; I do not quarrel with the gentleman, but I will say to my friend that though one rose from the dead about this matter and would come to bear testimony to him I do not think he would heed it. Now I will yield to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. NORTON].

Mr. NORTON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I wanted to ask the gentleman a question, but I want to preface it by a remark.

After consultation with the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Chairman, I withdraw my request. [Laughter.] I think the House will not laugh when they understand why I withdrew my request.

Mr. CANNON. I like to see the House amused, even if it may be at my own expense. Now, then, having in view the fact that the hour of 5 has almost arrived, and having been notified by a messenger from the Speaker that perhaps it would be seemly to move that the committee do now rise that certain resolutions may be offered touching a deceased member, which information I was conveying to the gentleman from Ohio, and having taken the committee into my confidence, I now move that the committee rise.

The motion was agreed to.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. HOPKINS, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill (H. R. 14017) making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and had directed him to report the same back to the House with sundry amendments with the recommendation that as amended the bill do pass; that that committee had also had under consideration the bill (H. R. 14018) making appropriations for sundry civil expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, and for other purposes, and had come to no resolution thereon.

The SPEAKER. The first question is on agreeing to the amendments to the Army appropriation bill.

The amendments were considered, and agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time; was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. HULL, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

NAVAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up the naval appropriation bill with Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois calls up the naval appropriation bill with Senate amendments.

Mr. FOSS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House nonconcur in the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks that the House nonconcur in the Senate amendments and ask for a conference. Is there objection?

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. Reserving the right to object, I wish to ask the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss] whether this request is preferred by him after a conference with the entire membership of the Committee on Naval Affairs?

Mr. FOSS. We had an informal meeting of the committee at which there were present ten or a dozen members, and it was agreeable to those present that this action be taken.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. That was the unanimous expression of the committee?

Mr. FOSS. Yes, sir.

Mr. MUDD. Was there not some arrangement as to having a separate vote on individual items of the bill?

Mr. FOSS. Yes; there was some understanding as to having that when we come in with the conference report.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. What is proposed to be done?

The SPEAKER. To nonconcur in the amendments of the Senate to the naval appropriation bill and ask for conference.

Mr. CANNON. If such is the desire of the gentleman in charge of the bill, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, I have no objection, provided the gentleman feels sure the House will have an opportunity to pass upon the Senate amendment touching the construction of the four new ships.

Mr. FOSS. I can not give the gentleman such assurance, for I am not a conferee. If I should be a conferee, it is my judgment there will be such an opportunity.

Mr. CANNON. I will take my friend's judgment on that.

Mr. RICHARDSON of Tennessee. I understood the agreement was we should have a separate vote on that proposition and some others.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I should like to have an understanding that when this matter comes up in the House from the committee of conference there may be discussion upon any of the amendments of the Senate.

Mr. FOSS. I hardly think it would do to make an arrangement of that kind. We might as well take up the measure at once and discuss it in the House.

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I mean upon matters which were in controversy.

Mr. FOSS. Oh, yes; upon those matters that were in controversy I think there will be an opportunity for a separate vote. Is there any particular proposition which the gentleman has in his mind?

Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts. I do not know of any just at this time; but there may be some such questions, and I thought as an understanding was being had in regard to the battle ships there might be something else on which some discussion would be desired.

The SPEAKER. The Chair hears no objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. Foss], and it is so ordered.

The Chair appoints as conferees on the part of the House the gentleman from Illinois, Mr. Foss; the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. DAYTON, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. CUMMINGS.

STOCK-POISONING PLANTS OF MONTANA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, referred to the Committee on Printing, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture recommending the printing of the accompanying report on the stock-poisoning plants of Montana.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION, February 12, 1901.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. BAKER, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles; when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 13531. An act to constitute a new division of the eastern judicial district of Texas, and to provide for the holding of terms of court at Sherman, Tex., and for the appointment of a clerk for said court, and for other purposes;

H. R. 12897. An act to extend the privileges provided by an act entitled "An act to amend the statutes in relation to the immediate transportation of dutiable goods, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1880, as amended; and

H. R. 13374. An act authorizing the Indiana, Illinois and Iowa Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across St. Joseph River at or near the city of St. Joseph, Mich.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 57. An act granting an increase of pension to Joshua B. Harris;

S. 419. An act amending the act providing for the appointment of a Mississippi River Commission, etc., approved June 28, 1879;

S. 63. An act granting an increase of pension to Cyrus A. B. Fox;

S. 1044. An act granting an increase of pension to Rachel M. Worley;

S. 1311. An act granting an increase of pension to Ross Wheatley;

S. 1203. An act granting an increase of pension to Lewis S. Horsey;

S. 1204. An act granting an increase of pension to William Gaddes;

S. 1604. An act granting an increase of pension to Harvey Graham;

S. 1628. An act granting a pension to Adolph Schrei;

S. 1761. An act granting a pension to Girard Welch;

S. 1986. An act granting an increase of pension to Fanny Healy;

S. 1828. An act granting a pension to Emma T. Martin;

S. 1872. An act granting an increase of pension to Hiram J. Reamer;

S. 5775. An act to authorize the Glassport Bridge Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Monongahela River, in the State of Pennsylvania;

S. 2901. An act granting a pension to Abner C. Ricketts;

S. 3224. An act granting a pension to Amos L. Hood;

S. 3680. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary Elizabeth Moore;

S. 4022. An act granting a pension to William B. Caldwell;

S. 3758. An act granting an increase of pension to William I. Miller;

S. 3881. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry D. Johnson;

S. 4073. An act granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Edwards, jr.;

S. 4147. An act granting an increase of pension to Samuel N. Hoyt;

S. 4155. An act granting a pension to Julia S. Goodfellow;

S. 4165. An act granting a pension to Dora Renfro;

S. 4277. An act granting a pension to Albert Wetzel;

S. 4418. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew J. Woodman;

S. 4440. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Stewart;

S. 4556. An act granting an increase of pension to William Fox;

S. 4587. An act granting an increase of pension to Cora Van D. Chenoweth;

S. 4788. An act granting an increase of pension to George P. Beach;

S. 4856. An act granting an increase of pension to William F. Cloud;

S. 4789. An act granting an increase of pension to Bernard Wagner;

S. 4836. An act granting a pension to Carrie E. Babcock;

S. 4841. An act granting an increase of pension to George A. Parker;

S. 4859. An act granting an increase of pension to Emily A. Wentworth;

S. 4876. An act granting an increase of pension to Mary A. Merritt;

S. 3375. An act granting an increase of pension to Martha M. Bedell;

S. 5015. An act granting a pension to Betsey L. Woodman;

S. 5005. An act granting an increase of pension to Frederick Vogel;

S. 5016. An act granting an increase of pension to Frances F. Buffum;

S. 5017. An act granting a pension to George H. Shapley;

S. 5032. An act granting an increase of pension to John Geibel;

S. 5033. An act granting a pension to Lizzie Barrett;

S. 5036. An act granting an increase of pension to Norton Schermerhorn;

S. 5045. An act granting a pension to Eliza N. Lord;

S. 5081. An act granting an increase of pension to Joseph B. Whiting;

S. 2226. An act granting an increase of pension to Henry Muhs;

S. 3264. An act granting an increase of pension to William J. Cannon, alias James Cannon;

S. 3338. An act granting a pension to Mary A. Morton;

S. 3501. An act granting an increase of pension to Kate Harbaugh;

S. 2109. An act granting an increase of pension to Carroll W. Fuller;

S. 2228. An act granting an increase of pension to Oliver W. Miller;

S. 2319. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles C. Bunty;

S. 2624. An act granting a pension to Mary M. Kean;

S. 2621. An act granting an increase of pension to Charles Frye;

S. 2879. An act granting a pension to Mary E. Griffiths;

S. 2886. An act granting an increase of pension to Thomas T. Phillips;

S. 2907. An act granting a pension to Henrietta Parrott;

S. 2914. An act granting a pension to William E. Carter;

S. 3750. An act granting a pension to Paulina Smith;

S. 2107. An act granting a pension to James Brown;

S. 2102. An act granting an increase of pension to Andrew Reed;

S. 5360. An act granting an increase of pension to Hiram I. Hoyt;

S. 5549. An act granting an increase of pension to Horatio N. Davis;

S. 5259. An act granting an increase of pension to William Gordon;

S. 5776. An act for establishment of a beacon light near Grubbs Landing, Delaware River, Delaware;

S. 2991. An act confirming two locations of Chippewa half-breed scrip in the State (then Territory) of Utah;

S. 5090. An act granting a pension to Minerva McClernand;

S. 5126. An act granting an increase of pension to John D. Thompson;

S. 5776. An act granting an increase of pension to Jacob Hight;

S. 5140. An act granting a pension to Mary C. Coombs;

S. 5091. An act granting a pension to Hannah L. Palmer;

S. 5192. An act granting an increase of pension to Richard O. Greenleaf; and

S. 5235. An act granting a pension to Mary R. Pike.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to Mr. MORRELL, for three days, on account of serious illness in his family.

DEATH OF HON. ALBERT D. SHAW.

Mr. RAY of New York. Mr. Speaker, it is my solemn and painful duty to announce the death of my colleague, Colonel ALBERT DUANE SHAW, a Representative from the Twenty-fourth Congressional district, State of New York.

He died suddenly Sunday morning last, and of the visit of the grim messenger Death he had no premonition.

Colonel Shaw was born in New York State December 27, 1841, and educated at Canton University. In June, 1861, he enlisted in the Thirty-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and having served his term of enlistment was made special agent of the War Department in 1863. Subsequently he was a member of the legislature of the State of New York, and later still served as United States Consul at Toronto, Canada, and Manchester, England, from 1868 to 1885. He served as department commander of the Grand Army of the Republic, State of New York, and in 1896 was unanimously elected commander in chief of the national encampment of that organization. He was elected to the Fifty-sixth Congress in the fall of 1900 to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. Charles A. Chickering, and had served in this House from December 4 last only. But during that time he had won the esteem of his fellow-members and made many close friends. He was elected to the Fifty-seventh Congress at the same time. His wife died February 9, 1900, and he is survived by a son and two daughters.

In private life Colonel SHAW was honest, faithful, and active in all that made for the good of his fellow-men. His record as a soldier was without blemish. He was faithful to his old comrades and ever diligent and earnest in favoring wise and just legislation for their benefit. He was loved and respected in Grand Army circles throughout the United States. He was a loving, devoted husband, a kind, indulgent father. In private life he was earnest, faithful, upright, and ever seeking the good of his fellow-citizens. In public life he was honest, reliable, capable, and patriotic. He was well and favorably known, honored, and respected in his own and in foreign countries.

Mr. Speaker, I offer the resolutions which I send to the Clerk's desk, and move their adoption.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolutions offered by the gentleman from New York.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives has heard with deep regret and profound sorrow of the death of the Hon. ALBERT D. SHAW, a Representative from the State of New York.

Resolved, That by his death the nation has lost a most able, devoted, and patriotic servant.

Resolved, That the Clerk communicate these resolutions to the Senate and transmit a copy thereof to the family of the deceased.

Resolved, That as a further mark of respect that the House do now adjourn.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolutions. The ayes have it, the resolutions are adopted, and in pursuance thereof the House now stands adjourned until 12 o'clock noon to-morrow.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 9 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, the following executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of appropriation for a barn at the Indian school at Lawrence, Kans.—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting an estimate of deficiency in appropriation for relief and civilization of Chippewas in Minnesota—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of War, transmitting, with a letter from the Chief of Engineers, report of survey of Brazos River, Texas—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a communication from the Secretary of the Interior submitting a deficiency estimate of appropriation for improvements at the Government Hospital for the Insane—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting a copy of the findings of fact in the case of Henry Hull, administrator of the estate of Isaac Hull, against the United States—to the Committee on War Claims, and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, recommending that an unexpended balance of appropriation for light and fog signals at Grays Harbor, Washington, be made available for construction of quarters for light keepers on the Pacific coast—to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several Calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. JOY, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 14038) to revive and amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the Pittsburgh and Mansfield Railroad Company to construct and maintain a bridge across the Monongahela River," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2801); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. ADAMSON, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13992) authorizing the construction of a bridge across the Cumberland River at or near Carthage, Tenn., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2802); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13951) authorizing Calhoun County, State of Texas, to construct and maintain a free bridge across Port Lavaca Bay, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2803); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5814) to authorize the Louisville and Nashville Railroad Company to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Choctawhatchee River at Geneva, Ala., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2805); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SOUTHARD, from the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 2564) to establish a mint of the United States at Tacoma, in the State of Washington, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2828); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. OVERSTREET, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13843) to amend section 7 of "An act to establish circuit courts of appeal and to define and regulate in certain cases the jurisdiction of the courts of the United States, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1891, as amended by act approved February 18, 1895, and further amended by act approved June 6, 1900, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2849); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. SHERMAN, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13907) to authorize the Georgia Pine Railway, of Georgia, to construct a bridge across the Flint River, a navigable stream, in Decatur County, Ga., reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2853); which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. WARNER, from the Committee on Revision of the Laws, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5573) to amend section 203 of Title III of the act entitled "An act making further provisions for a civil government for Alaska, and for other purposes," reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2854); which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. STALLINGS, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12481) granting an increase of pension to John J. Martin, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2793); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. VREELAND, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7420) to grant a pension to Esther B. Guthrie, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2794); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. WEEKS, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4625) granting a pension to James M. Long, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2795); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. VREELAND, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13520) granting an increase of pension to Cornelia Hays, reported the same with

amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2796); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7539) granting a pension to Peter J. Keleher, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2797); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. STALLINGS, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 7321) for the relief of Armilda J. Luttrell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2798); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. DE GRAFFENREID, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13136) granting an increase of pension to Ambrose Burton, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2799); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BROMWELL, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9843) granting an increase of pension to John A. Hardy, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2800); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. LOUDENSLAGER, from the Committee on Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4734) granting a pension to Mary A. O'Brien, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2804); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12271) granting an increase of pension to Edwin J. Godfrey, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2806); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13215) granting an increase of pension to Andrew R. Jones, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2807); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13884) granting an increase of pension to Andrew H. Gifford, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2808); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13717) granting an increase of pension to James Harper, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2809); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5146) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. Jones, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2810); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CONNER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13124) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Young, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2811); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5191) granting an increase of pension to Selah V. Reeve, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2812); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 914) granting a pension to Charles L. Summers, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2813); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13998) granting an increase of pension to Margaret L. B. Parsons, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2814); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CROWLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2079) granting a pension to William Ashmead, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2815); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CONNER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12747) granting a pension to Arline E. McNutt, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2816); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1365) granting an increase of pension to Lorinda N. Smith, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2817); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 10727), granting a pension to Frances A. Wilkins, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2818); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3280), granting an increase of pension to Henry Keene, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2819); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13504) for the relief of Catherine Pflueger, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2820); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5397) granting a pension to Charity McKenney, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2821); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5726) granting an increase of pension to Zadok S. Howe, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2822); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 3194) for the relief of A. Cusi-mano & Co., reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2823); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 9792) for the relief of William C. Man, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2824); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GRAFF, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13250) for the relief of B. W. Johnson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2825); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. OTEY, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 786) for the relief of William Leech, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2826); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. BOUTELL of Illinois, from the Committee on Claims, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11604) for relief of Jacob B. Phillips, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2827); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 3193) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Force, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2829); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12656) granting a pension to James F. Merrill, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2830); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2843) granting an increase of pension to John Johnson, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2831); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. GASTON, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4102) granting an increase of pension to Abram O. Kindy, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2832); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5119) granting a pension to Jessie A. Bruner, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2833); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MIERS of Indiana, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 12643) granting an increase of pension to Mary Morely, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2834); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 11753) granting an increase of pension to Isaac F. Russell, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2835); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5272) granting an increase

of pension to Thomas M. Wimer, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2886); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 233) granting an increase of pension to Mary F. Hooper, of Providence, R. I., widow of Quincy A. Hooper, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2887); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5363) granting a pension to Lizzie Wattles, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2838); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13268) granting an increase of pension to J. S. Vallet, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2889); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4960) granting a pension to Minerva M. Helmer, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2840); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CROWLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13270) granting a pension to Calvin S. James, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2841); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 1602) granting an increase of pension to Morris B. Kimball, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2842); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CROWLEY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13777) granting a pension to Lucy B. Bevis, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2843); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. MINOR, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 4692) granting an increase of pension to Asa W. Taylor, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2844); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5204) granting an increase of pension to John Scott, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2845); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CALDERHEAD, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4387) granting a pension to Joseph R. Martin, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2846); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. CONNER, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2227) granting an increase of pension to Uriah Clark, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2847); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. SULLOWAY, from the Committee on Invalid Pensions, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 5172) granting a pension to Elizabeth Bughman, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2848); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the Senate (S. 2936) authorizing the appointment of James A. Hutton to a captaincy of infantry in the United States Army, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2850); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HULL, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13854) amending the record of Granville H. Twining, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2851); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 13853) amending the record of Roy V. Witter, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2852); which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BULL: A bill (H. R. 14162) to reduce and reorganize

the Pay Corps of the United States Navy—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. MOODY of Oregon: A bill (H. R. 14163) to authorize the Portland, Nehalem and Tillamook Railway Company to construct a bridge across Nehalem Bay and River, in the State of Oregon—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GILLET of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 14164) providing for the adjustment of accounts of laborers, workmen, and mechanics arising under the eight-hour law—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MONDELL: A bill (H. R. 14165) dedicating the proceeds of the sales of public lands to the construction of works in the aid of irrigation, and for other purposes—to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. RICHARDSON of Alabama: A bill (H. R. 14166) to increase the compensation of fourth-class postmasters—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. TONGUE: A memorial of the legislature of Oregon, asking an appropriation of \$44,000 to Curry County, Oreg.—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NAPHEN: Resolutions of the legislature of Massachusetts, relative to the abolition of the United States tax on tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WILSON of Arizona: Memorial of legislature of Arizona, to have its present session extended thirty days—to the Committee on the Territories.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMSON: A bill (H. R. 14167) granting an increase of pension to Charity M. Farmer—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CLARK: A bill (H. R. 14168) granting a pension to James W. Conaway—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONG: A bill (H. R. 14169) for the relief of Thomas B. Vanhorn—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RANDELL: A bill (H. R. 14170) granting a pension to Dr. Ralph Lewis Graves—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REEDER: A bill (H. R. 14171) granting a pension to James W. Tunnell—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 14172) to correct the military record of Thomas Keating—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. UNDERHILL: A bill (H. R. 14173) granting a pension to Cornealius Springsteel—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 14174) granting an increase of pension to Cloyd C. Maulding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, the following petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ADAMSON: Petition of Charity M. Farmer, of Idavaper, Ga., to accompany House bill granting her an increase of pension—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. COONEY: Petitions of citizens of Glasgow, Marshall, Republic, Ashgrove, and Fairplay, Mo., for the repeal of the stamp tax on checks, notes, bonds, etc.—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FITZGERALD of Massachusetts: Resolution of General Joseph Hooker Command, No. 9, Union Veterans' Union, favoring Senate bill No. 5055, granting pensions to soldiers who were confined in Confederate prisons—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GARDNER of Michigan: Petition of Michigan Woman's Christian Temperance Union, favoring the exclusion of alcoholic liquor from countries inhabited chiefly by native races—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. GIBSON: Petition of citizens of Maryville, Tenn., relative to alcoholic trade in Africa, and to prevent the sale of opium, intoxicants, etc., to undeveloped and child-like races—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petition of citizens of Maryville, Tenn., in favor of an amendment to the Constitution against polygamy—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: Petition of W. D. Baker and other citizens of Hyannis, Mass., for the repeal of the duty on tea—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. GRIFFITH: Evidence of W. S. Grubaugh, to accompany House bill No. 13079, granting a pension to Lieut. E. F. Wilkins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HEDGE: Petition of C. D. Trumbull and other citizens of Morning Sun, Iowa, favoring the exclusion of alcoholic liquor from countries inhabited chiefly by native races—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HEPBURN: Petition of Margaret E. McCraig and numerous other citizens of Lenox, Iowa, urging the banishment of

the liquor traffic in Africa—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HENRY of Connecticut: Petition of Saxton B. Little and others, favoring the passage of the Gillett bill for the protection of native races in our islands against intoxicants and opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HILL: Petition of L. P. Dean, of Bridgeport, Conn., favoring the exclusion of alcoholic liquor from the New Hebrides and all countries inhabited chiefly by native races—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. KERR of Ohio: Petition of citizens of Carlington, Ohio, against the parcels-post system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MERCER: Petition of citizens of Pender, Nebr., advocating the passage of the Gillett bill, for the protection of native races in our islands against intoxicants and opium—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

Also, petitions of Herman Kountze, of Omaha; J. A. Hanna, of Greely; C. H. Love, of Hastings; F. B. Knapp, Cedar Bluffs, and Owens & Price, of Thayer, Nebr., with reference to revenue reduction—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. NAPHEN: Resolutions of General Joseph Hooker Command, No. 9, Union Veterans' Union, Boston, favoring Senate bill No. 5055, allowing pensions to soldiers who were confined in Confederate prisons—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL: Petition of C. J. Greenwood and other citizens of Connecticut, favoring the exclusion of alcoholic liquor from the New Hebrides and all countries inhabited chiefly by native races—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. SIBLEY: Petition of Samuel B. Wilson, for a pension, to accompany House bill No. 13923—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. STEPHENS of Texas (by request): Paper to accompany House bill No. 14148, relating to additional judges for the courts of the Territory of Oklahoma—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THAYER: Resolutions of National Bank Cashiers' Association of Massachusetts, against taxing bank capital and against stamp tax on bank checks—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. VANDIVER: Petition of citizens of Sparta, Mo., for the repeal of the stamp tax on checks and war tax on bank capital—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WADSWORTH: Petition of 300 members of the Presbyterian Church of Wyoming, N. Y., for construction of dam across Gila River, San Carlos, Ariz., for purposes of irrigation for Pima Reservation—to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. JAMES R. WILLIAMS: Paper to accompany House bill granting a pension to Cloyd C. Maulding—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

SENATE.

WEDNESDAY, February 13, 1901.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. W. H. MILBURN, D. D.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. SEWELL, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Journal will stand approved.

STOCK-POISONING PLANTS OF MONTANA.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States; which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith for the information of the Congress a communication from the Secretary of Agriculture, recommending the printing of the accompanying report on the stock-poisoning plants of Montana.

WILLIAM MCKINLEY.

EXECUTIVE MANSION,
Washington, February 12, 1901.

VESSELS ENTITLED TO BENEFITS OF SHIPPING BILL.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair lays before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, in response to a resolution of the 11th instant, a statement prepared, as far as practicable, by the Commissioner of Navigation relative to the number of vessels and the tonnage of each vessel now registered as engaged in the foreign commerce and the number of vessels now engaged in the coastwise trade that can be registered for the foreign trade under the provisions of Senate bill No. 727, to promote the commerce and increase the foreign trade of the United States, and to provide auxiliary cruisers, transports, and seamen for Government use when necessary, etc. The communication will be referred to the Committee on Commerce and

printed, and the documents accompanying the communication will be referred to the committee, will not be printed, but will be on file.

FRENCH SPOILIATION CLAIMS.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims relating to the vessel sloop *Cygnat*, James Hunt, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

He also laid before the Senate a communication from the assistant clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting the conclusions of fact and of law filed under the act of January 20, 1885, in the French spoliation claims, relating to the vessel *Good Intent*, Nathaniel Gladding, master; which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Claims, and ordered to be printed.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

The bill (H. R. 13850) making appropriations for the diplomatic and consular service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1902, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

MARTHA C. M. FISHER.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 1792) granting a pension to Martha C. M. Fisher, which was, in line 9, before the word "dollars," to strike out "twenty" and insert "twelve."

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment made by the House.

The motion was agreed to.

JAMES M. FRY.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 3376) granting an increase of pension to James McFry, which were, in line 6, to strike out the name "James McFry" and insert "James M. Fry;" and to amend the title so as to read: "An act granting an increase of pension to James M. Fry."

Mr. GALLINGER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments made by the House.

The motion was agreed to.

CREDENTIALS.

Mr. CLARK presented the credentials of FRANCIS E. WARREN, chosen by the legislature of the State of Wyoming a Senator from that State for the term beginning March 4, 1901; which were read, and ordered to be filed.

MEMORIAL ADDRESSES ON THE LATE REPRESENTATIVE CLARKE.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, I give notice that Saturday, February 23, at 6 o'clock in the afternoon, I shall ask the Senate to consider resolutions paying tribute to the memory of Hon. FRANK G. CLARKE, late a Representative from the State of New Hampshire.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PRITCHARD presented the petition of O. H. L. Wernicke and sundry other citizens of Ohio, praying for the establishment of a national forest reserve in the Appalachian region; which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented the affidavit of Taylor Buckner, in support of the bill (S. 1033) for the relief of Benjamin F. Buckner and Taylor Buckner; which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. PERKINS presented a joint resolution of the legislature of California; which was ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[Amended in senate January 30, 1901. Assembly joint resolution No. 10. Introduced by Mr. Myers, January 17, 1901.]

Assembly joint resolution No. 10, relative to passage of the Grout bill now pending in the United States Senate.

Whereas there is pending in the Senate of the United States a bill known as the Grout bill, having for its purposes the regulation of the manufacture and sale of oleomargarine or oleomargarine butter; and

Whereas the dairymen of California are vitally interested in the passage of such bill, and that the operation of this bill would be very beneficial to the dairying industry of the State: Therefore, be it

Resolved by the assembly and senate of the State of California, jointly. That we respectfully urge the Senate of the United States to enact said bill at its present session.

Resolved, That the chief clerk of the assembly and secretary of the senate be directed to immediately mail this resolution to the honorable President of the Senate of the United States, and also to each of the Senators from the State of California in the United States Senate.

We hereby certify that this is a true and correct copy of assembly joint resolution No. 10, adopted in assembly January 17, 1901; adopted in Senate February 6, 1901.

Clio LLOYD,
Chief Clerk of the Assembly.
F. J. BRANDON,
Secretary of Senate.

Mr. PERKINS presented a resolution of the senate of California; which was referred to the Committee on Forest Reservations and